

THE CHRISTOCENTRIC SALVATION HISTORY OF IRENÆUS AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO THE ECCLESIASTICAL TRADITION AND VALENTINIAN GNOSTICISM

K. N. Booth

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD
at the
University of St Andrews



1974

Full metadata for this item is available in
St Andrews Research Repository
at:

<http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

Please use this identifier to cite or link to this item:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10023/13997>

This item is protected by original copyright

THE CHRISTOCENTRIC SALVATION HISTORY

OF IRENAEUS

AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO

THE ECCLESIASTICAL TRADITION

AND VALENTINIAN GNOSTICISM

VOLUME I

A thesis in fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
presented at the University of St. Andrews
by K.N. Booth

1974



ProQuest Number: 10166648

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10166648

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

Th 8197

STATEMENT AND DECLARATION

On 1st October, 1969 I was accepted as a Research Student under Ordinance General No. 12 and as a candidate for the degree of Ph.D. under the resolution of the University Court 1967 No. 1 with effect from that date.

I hereby declare that the following thesis is based on the results of research carried out by myself, that it is my own composition and that it has not previously been presented for a Higher Degree.

The Research was carried out at the University of St. Andrews.

.....

CERTIFICATE

I certify that Kenneth Neville Booth has spent nine terms of research at the University of St. Andrews, that he has fulfilled the conditions of the resolution of the University Court 1967 No. 1 and that he is qualified to submit this thesis in application for the degree of Ph.D.

.....

PREFACE

Irenaeus has a relationship with two different traditions: the tradition of Valentinian Gnosticism and others such as Marcion, a tradition which he opposed vehemently, and the ecclesiastical tradition which he was intent on defending. In his attack on the one and defence of the other Irenaeus expresses his own theological viewpoint, a dominant characteristic of which is the concept of Christocentric salvation history. The present work is a study of the relationship between these three, the two traditions and the Christocentric salvation history.

Part one is concerned mainly with methodology. Chapter one is a survey of recent studies of Irenaeus with particular reference to the problems of source materials in Irenaeus, the effect of his polemical task on his thought and writings, and the significance for him of salvation history. In chapter two the two traditions are examined and a sharp division of them into orthodoxy and heresy is rejected. The concept of salvation history is also examined in some detail.

Part two is devoted to a study of the ecclesiastical tradition before Irenaeus, in order to see how his predecessors thought of history and of the role of Christ in it. Chapter three is concerned with the Apostolic Fathers, chapter four with some apocryphal writings, and chapter five with the Greek Apologists. While numerous elements of the tradition that are taken up by Irenaeus are to be found in the ecclesiastical tradition, and indeed some outlines of salvation history can also be discerned, the fully integrated concept of a Christocentric salvation history is not present there.

Part three is a study of the salvation drama in Valentinian Gnosticism. Chapter six is concerned with the sources, chapter seven with an analysis of the drama, and chapter eight exposes the threat the drama posed to the ecclesiastical tradition, which may be described as the

threat of a complete and coherent drama that gives to the believer the security of knowing whence he has come, whither he is going, and where he now is. The task of any opponent is to replace this false knowledge with the true knowledge.

In part four we turn to Irenaeus. In chapter nine the Christocentric salvation history of Irenaeus is examined in detail. As a result of this examination we reach the conclusion in chapter ten that 'in the materials gathered from his own tradition, developed from a number of different sources, and woven together into a coherent and comprehensive historical drama of which Christ is the centre, Irenaeus finds an adequate reply to the coherent and comprehensive drama of Valentinian Gnosticism,' and therefore, by his Christocentric salvation history, makes a significant contribution to the polarisation of the ecclesiastical and Gnostic traditions.

The research for this thesis was carried out at the University of St. Andrews, but the final preparation was undertaken in between the demands of a teaching position at St. John's College, Auckland, New Zealand. Living in New Zealand has made keeping abreast of new material rather difficult, as bibliographical information may take up to four months to arrive and any books required a further four months or even longer. In addition, many periodicals of importance in the fields of Patristics and Gnosticism are not subscribed to by any University or College in Australasia.

I would like to take this opportunity of expressing my warm appreciation to all those who made it possible for me to carry out this study, and especially I would like to thank the following: The University of St. Andrews for granting me a University Research Scholarship, which enabled me to undertake the necessary work; the staffs of the University Libraries of St. Andrews and Utrecht, whose willing assistance was greatly appreciated; Professor T.E. Pollard who first introduced me to the Fathers of the

Early Church; Professor J. Zandee of Utrecht for much kindness and assistance during my term at the University of Utrecht; and above all, Professor R. McL. Wilson of the University of St. Andrews for his constant encouragement and meticulous supervision of my studies.

CONTENTS

	page
PREFACE	iv

PART ONE: INTERPRETING THE CHRISTOLOGY OF IRENAEUS

1. SOME RECENT STUDIES OF IRENAEUS	2
2. TRADITION AND SALVATION HISTORY IN RELATION TO THE STUDY OF IRENAEUS	20

PART TWO: THE ECCLESIASTICAL TRADITION BEFORE IRENAEUS

3. THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS	67
I I Clement	68
II Ignatius of Antioch	79
III The Epistle of Barnabas	109
IV The Shepherd of Hermas	124
4. THE APOCRYPHAL LITERATURE	137
I Epistula Apostolorum	138
II Pseudo-Clementine Writings	151
III The Acts of Paul	167
IV The Ascension of Isaiah	175
V Other Apocryphal Literature	186
5. THE GREEK APOLOGISTS	194
I Minor Works	195
II The Epistle to Diognetus	204
III Justin Martyr	212
IV Theophilus of Antioch	259
V Melito of Sardis	276

PART THREE: VALENTINIAN Gnosticism

6. VALENTINIAN SOURCES	303
I Literary Sources	303
II Background to the Valentinian Salvation Drama	327

7.	THE VALENTINIAN SALVATION DRAMA	353
	I Christ in the Pleroma	353
	II The Demiurge and the Lower World	403
	III The Descent of the Saviour	434
	IV Redemption	457
	V The Consummation	506
8.	THE CHALLENGE OF VALENTINIANISM	517

PART FOUR: IRENAEUS

9.	CHRISTOCENTRIC SALVATION HISTORY	541
	I The Godhead	542
	II Creation	573
	III Revelation	583
	IV The Incarnation	594
	V Redemption	619
	VI The Church	698
	VII The Consummation	733
10.	THE REPLY OF IRENAEUS TO THE CHALLENGE OF VALENTINIANISM	745

APPENDIX: A Note on the Texts of the Works by Irenaeus	761
---	-----

ABBREVIATIONS	764
---------------	-----

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I The Church Fathers	766
II Gnostic and Apocryphal Literature	770
III Books	773
IV Articles	785

PART ONE

INTERPRETING THE CHRISTOLOGY OF

IRENÆUS

CHAPTER ONE

SOME RECENT STUDIES OF IRENAEUS

Before any attempt can be made to present the Christology of Irenaeus, a number of problems must be solved. In the first place, neither of the extant works of Irenaeus is a work of systematic theology. Both works were written to serve special purposes, and the intention of Irenaeus must be taken into account before the theology can be examined. The aim and purpose of the adversus haereses is expressed in the original title: The Exposure and Overthrow of the Knowledge falsely so-called.⁽¹⁾ In other words, the work is a polemical treatise aimed at the exposure and refutation of certain misinterpretations of the gospel. Consequently,

1. This is the original title given by Irenaeus to the work now known as adversus haereses (*Ἐλεγχος καὶ ἀνατροπὴ τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως*), see adv. haer. IV pf. 1; H. ii 144; Dem. 99, Eusebius H.E. V 7 cf. adv. haer. I xxxi 4; H. i 244; II pf.1,2; H. i 250f. It was written by Irenaeus apparently at the request of a friend (adv. haer. I pf.3; H. i 4). The writing of the work may have occupied Irenaeus for some considerable time. Indications of date are few, but the list of bishops at Rome (adv. haer. III iii 3; H. ii 10ff.) concludes with Eleutherus who was Bishop of Rome from 174 AD. Irenaeus also refers to his situation in Gaul (adv. haer. I pf. 3; H. i 4), where he succeeded Pothinus as Bishop of Lyons probably in 177 or 178 (Eusebius, H.E. V 5.8). The work was probably written during the last two decades of the second Century. On the text and the

the attention of Irenaeus is focused on those aspects of theology which have been undermined by his opponents, and in his reply to these points, he can scarcely avoid laying heavy emphasis on certain themes in his own theology. What effect has the polemical intention of Irenaeus had on his theology and its presentation?

We are fortunate that we possess another work by Irenaeus that is not overtly polemical, his Proof of the Apostolic Preaching.⁽²⁾ Irenaeus wrote the work to one

1. (contd.) editions used in the present study see the Appendix: 'A Note on the Texts of the Works by Irenaeus', pp. 76lff.
2. The story of the discovery in 1904 of the Armenian translation of this work by Irenaeus is recounted in every translation that has been published and need not detain us here. Before its discovery the title of the work was known to us from Eusebius who mentions that Irenaeus wrote a work of this name to 'brother Marcianus' (H.E. V 26). The authenticity of the work is beyond any reasonable doubt, if only on the grounds of its close similarity in outlook to the adversus haereses. Given that Irenaeus refers to his adversus haereses in the Demonstratio (99), the Demonstratio must have been written at some time during the last two decades of the second Century, while he was Bishop of Lyons. On the text and the editions used in the present study see the Appendix: 'A Note on the Texts of the Works by Irenaeus', pp. 76lff.

Marcianus,⁽³⁾ an absent friend, and he expressed his purpose as follows:

As it is, since we are at the present time distant in body from each other, we have not delayed, so far as may be, to commune with you a little in writing, and to set forth in brief the preaching of the truth, to confirm your faith. What we are sending you is in the form of notes on the main points, so that you may find much matter in short space, comprehending in a few details all the members of the body of truth, and receiving in brief the proof of the things of God.⁽⁴⁾

Although Irenaeus does not set out to refute false teaching in the Demonstratio, his pre-occupation with some Gnostic ideas can still be discerned; specific references to the necessity of right belief are to be found in several places,⁽⁵⁾ and the whole book is intended to aid Marcianus in the refutation of false teaching.⁽⁶⁾ The Demonstratio is no more a work of systematic theology than the adversus haereses, in spite of Irenaeus's own reference to it as 'notes on the main points'. What Irenaeus wishes to do is to prove to Marcianus that what the Apostles

3. About this Marcianus we know nothing but the name with certainty.

4. Dem. 1

5. See Dem. 1, 99, 100; see also J.P. Smith, St. Irenaeus Proof of the Apostolic Preaching (London, 1952; =ACW 16), pp. 23-31.

6. Dem. 1

preached was the truth, not to expound to him the whole Apostolic kerygma.⁽⁷⁾ To what extent, then, has Irenaeus's purpose dictated the form and content of the theology expressed in the work?

Even when the purposes of both the adversus haereses and the Demonstratio have been taken into account, another serious problem arises before the Christology of Irenaeus can be expounded. This problem concerns the literary unity of the major work. In the first place, there are several direct references by Irenaeus to earlier Christian writers. He refers to Papias⁽⁸⁾ and to Polycarp,⁽⁹⁾ he quotes from Justin Martyr's adversus Marcionem⁽¹⁰⁾ and summarises the first Epistle of Clement;⁽¹¹⁾ he refers

7. On the limited purpose of the work see S. Weber, Schrift zum Erweis der apostolischen Verkündigung (Münich, 1912) pp. viiiff., with particular reference to the danger of reading too much into the fact that the work says nothing about ecclesiastical hierarchy, ceremonial or sacraments, of seeing the work as a 'pre-reformation' reformation document, complete with no hierarchy, no ceremonial and sola fide. Much of what Weber says is directed against the concluding remarks of Harnack (in Schrift zum Erweise der apostolischen Verkündigung, K. Ter Mekerdttschian and E. Ter Minassiantz (edd.), with Notes by A. von Harnack, Leipzig, 1907;= TU 31.1, pp. 65f.) Smith (op.cit., pp. 19-21) remarks: 'The author wishes to prove that what the apostles preached was true rather than to give an exposition of their preaching, and is concerned for the "integrity" of the faith not so much in the sense of its "exhaustiveness" as in the sense of its "soundness"' (p. 20). Cf. A. Benoit, S. Irénée. Introduction à l'étude de sa théologie (Paris, 1960), pp. 234-37.

nine times to an anonymous predecessor,⁽¹²⁾ some of which references may be to Melito of Sardis;⁽¹³⁾ he refers seven times in the section IV xxvii 1 - xxxii 1 to a presbyter⁽¹⁴⁾ and eight times to presbyters, in the plural,⁽¹⁵⁾ quoting them in a source that seems to stem from Papias.⁽¹⁶⁾

8. adv.haer. V xxxiii 4; H. ii 418.
9. adv.haer. III iii 4; H. ii 12.
10. adv.haer. IV vi 2; H. ii 158.
11. adv.haer. III iii 3; H. ii 10f.
12. adv.haer. I pf.; H. i 3; I xiii 3; H. i 119; I xv 6; H. i 155f.; III xvii 4; H. ii 95; III xxiii 3; H. ii 126; IV pf. 1; H. ii 144; IV iv 2; H. ii 153; IV xli 1; H. ii 304; V xvii 4; H. ii 372.
13. See Benoit, op. cit., pp. 17-19. Cf. also J. Daniélou in a review of Benoit's S.Irénée (RSR 49(1961), pp. 582 - 85), who suggests that Melito is the possible source also of some of the Old Testament references in Irenaeus and of some of his references to Stoicism. Cf. id., 'Figure et événement chez Méliton de Sardes', in Neotestamentica et Patristica (Leiden, 1962; = Supplements to Novum Testamentum 6), pp. 282 - 92, esp. p.287.
14. adv.haer. IV xxvii 1; H. ii 238f.; IV xxvii 1; H. ii 241; IV xxvii 2; H. ii 242; IV xxviii 1; H. ii 244 (reading 'presbyter', not 'presbyteri'; see Benoit, op. cit., pp. 19 - 21); IV xxx 1; H. ii 248; IV xxxi 1; H. ii 251; IV xxxii 1; H. ii 254.
15. adv.haer. II xxii 5; H. i 331; V v 1; H. ii 331; V xxx 1; H. ii 406; V xxxiii 3; H. ii 417; V xxxvi 1; H. ii 427f.; V xxxvi 2; H. ii 428f.; Dem. 3, 61.
16. Benoit (op. cit., p.25) points out that the literal interpretation of Is.11.1 - 10 attributed to the presbyters in Dem. 61 but rejected by Irenaeus occurs without comment in adv.haer. V xxxiii 4; H. ii 418, where Papias's name is mentioned. Cf. ch.10, n. 32.

In addition, Irenaeus shares three misquotations of Scripture with Pseudo-Barnabas,⁽¹⁷⁾ the explanation for which is probably to be found in a common Testimonia source,⁽¹⁸⁾ and twice he quotes The Shepherd of Hermas.⁽¹⁹⁾

These references to other writers raise a second problem. How extensive was the use made of them by Irenaeus? Since there was no convention of quotation marks and foot-notes, we have no way of seeing at a glance how much Irenaeus has quoted from his sources. Some discrepancies between various statements in the works of Irenaeus suggest that Irenaeus may have borrowed material from some source and made no attempt to harmonize what he took over with his own thoughts.⁽²⁰⁾ Therefore we may ask: How extensive is the borrowing? How extensive are the discrepancies? Do they also apply to the theology, or has Irenaeus adapted and re-shaped what he has taken over? In

17. adv.haer. IV xvii 2; H.ii 195 = Barn. 2.10; adv.haer.

IV xxxiii 13; H.ii 268 and Dem. 88 = Barn. 6.1f.; Dem. 79 = Barn. 5.13.

18. See Benoit, op.cit., p.25f., and especially J.R.Harris, Testimonies (2 vols., Cambridge, 1916/1920), pp.61-75.

19. Hermas, Pastor 26.1; = adv.haer. IV xx 2; H.ii 213f.; Dem. 4.

20. E.g. the interpretation of Is. 11.1-10 mentioned above (n. 16), and the consummation of the world in 6,000 years (adv.haer. V xxviii 3; H.ii 402f.) and when the number to be saved is complete (adv.haer. II xxxiii 5; H. i 380).

short, are we justified in taking the work of Irenaeus as a theological unity? Furthermore, what is the significance of their presence in a polemical work?

How are these problems associated with the purpose of the two works of Irenaeus and their literary structure to be resolved, and what effect do the answers have on the study of Irenaeus's theology? The problems, their significance and their solution may be examined through a study of some of the recent works on Irenaeus; for all who have written on Irenaeus have had to come to some conclusions about these things. Of all the works on Irenaeus published in the last century or so, none perhaps has been quite so significant or controversial as the last major work of Friedrich Loofs, posthumously published in 1930.⁽²¹⁾ It is an example of an extremely negative evaluation of the significance of Irenaeus both as a writer and as a theologian, but it also marks a watershed in the studies devoted to the theology of Irenaeus. Here we shall be concerned mainly with developments in the study of Irenaeus since 1930, but to appreciate the significance of Loofs' contribution, we must give a brief account of the major works published before that date.

21. Theophilus von Antiochien adversus Marcionem und die anderen theologischen Quellen bei Irenaeus (Leipzig, 1930; = TU 46).

Up till 1930 the various works produced⁽²²⁾ generally approach Irenaeus from what may be termed a systematic point of view. This is, the work of Irenaeus is treated as a whole, and his teaching on the various headings of systematic theology is sought. Although all the scholars acknowledge the polemical purpose of the adversus haereses, the extent to which this fact is taken into account in assessing Irenaeus's own theology varies enormously, from Hitchcock's approach in which little attention is paid to it, to Ziegler who constantly refers to the situation in which Irenaeus wrote and the opponents he attacks. Nevertheless, even by Ziegler the theology of Irenaeus is set over against the propositions of his opponents rather than interpreted in the light of its polemical purpose. With regard to the presence of inconsistencies in the theology of Irenaeus, Ziegler again was the one who took this point most seriously and attempted to explain it rather than explain it away. Ziegler accounts for these inconsistencies by

22. L. Duncker, Des heiligen Irenaeus Christologie in Zusammenhange mit dessen theologischen und anthropologischen Grundlehren (Göttingen, 1843); H. Ziegler, Irenäus der Bischof von Lyon. Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte der altkatholischen Kirche (Berlin, 1871); P. Beuzart, Essai sur la théologie d'Irénée (Le Puy-en-Velay, 1908); F.R.M. Hitchcock, Irenaeus of Lugdunum. A Study of his Teaching (Cambridge, 1914); F. Vernet, 'Irénée (saint)', in DTC, vol. 7, columns 2394 - 2533, with a very full bibliography of material on Irenaeus up to that time; G.N. Bonwetsch, Die Theologie des Irenäus (Gütersloh, 1925; = Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, II/9).

seeing Irenaeus as the representative of the Church's tradition rather than as an original thinker in his own right. Here again, however, the point has still not been pursued to its conclusion. If Irenaeus represents the tradition of the Church, how exactly does he stand in relation to it? What is the content of that tradition? Can it be differentiated from Irenaeus's own views at any point? How extensively has Irenaeus used it? When he uses it does he follow it slavishly or adapt it liberally? Can the tradition itself be regarded as a unity or does it consist of various strands? The answers of Ziegler, as far as they go, insist on the contribution of Irenaeus to some aspects of theology, even if he did not compound the whole into a single coherent logical system. This whole question of the relationship of Irenaeus to the tradition he uses was to receive its most intensive examination in the work of Loofs, and the conclusions that he drew from that examination were to make of Irenaeus himself a very minor figure in the development of Christian doctrine.

Loofs, building on the researches of Harnack⁽²³⁾ and Bousset,⁽²⁴⁾ subjected the adversus haereses of Irenaeus to

23. A. Harnack, 'Der Presbyter-Prediger des Irenäus (IV 27.1 - 32.1). Bruchstücke und Nachklänge der ältesten exegetisch-polemischen Homilien', in Philotesia. Paul Kleinert zum LXX Geburtstag dargebracht (Berlin, 1907), pp. 1 - 37.
24. W. Bousset, Jüdisch-Christlicher Schulbetrieb in Alexandria und Rom. Literarische Untersuchungen zu Philo und Clemens von Alexandria Justin und Irenäus (Göttingen, 1915; = FRLANT 23), esp. pp. 272 - 82 on Irenaeus.

a rigorous source analysis and identified some six sources,⁽²⁵⁾ the most important being the lost adversus Marcionem of Theophilus of Antioch. These sources had substantially affected the work of Irenaeus, Loofs claimed. In addition, there was the influence of Justin Martyr on Irenaeus. On this question Loofs had little to say because, in his opinion, it is impossible to distinguish Irenaeus's own theology from the influence of Justin.⁽²⁶⁾ In the light of all this Loofs' conclusion is not in the least surprising: 'It is clearly evident, that both as a writer and as a theologian he (sc. Theophilus of Antioch) was greater than Irenaeus.'⁽²⁷⁾ The major weakness of Loofs' case, quite apart from any details,⁽²⁸⁾ was that he never took Irenaeus's polemical

25. IQT = Irenäus Quelle Theophilus, and more specifically his adversus Marcionem; IQU = Irenäus Quelle U, a source so close to IQT that they are to be identified; IQP = Irenäus Quelle Presbyter (cf. the references above, n. 14); IQA = Irenäus Quelle Asien, Asia Minor being the probable place of origin; IQS = Irenäus Quelle Senioren (cf. the references to the elders above, n.15); IQE = Irenäus Quelle Exegeses, from the title of Papias's work (Expositions of the Oracles of the Lord) (cf. the references above, n. 16). IQS is itself part of IQE.
26. Loofs, op. cit., pp. 339 - 43. Cf. the section heading: 'Die Unmöglichkeit, die eigene Theologie des Irenaeus und den Einfluss Justins auf ihn auseinanderzuhalten' (ibid., p. 339).
27. op. cit., p. 431.
28. The work of Loofs was subjected to detailed criticism by two in particular of those who reviewed it; F.R.M. Hitchcock, 'Loofs' Theory of Theophilus of Antioch as a Source of Irenaeus', in JTS 38 (1937), pp. 130 - 39, 255 - 66; id., 'Loofs' Asiatic Source (IQA) and the Ps-Justin De Resur-

task into account. Assuming that Irenaeus did use the sources that Loofs claims, what was Irenaeus attempting to do with all his material from whatever source?

Since 1930 there has been a much more serious attempt to avoid determining the theological questions to which Irenaeus was expected to give answers, and at the same time correct the impression given by Loofs' study. Recently, scholars have been content to begin with the stated purpose of Irenaeus and then to uncover the main lines of Irenaeus's own thinking. Some particularly important contributions have been made to our knowledge of Irenaeus by scholars who have worked along these lines. (29)

In 1960 A. Benoit produced the best introduction to Irenaeus to date. (30) Benoit's willingness to take not only the discrepancies in Irenaeus but also the purpose of Irenaeus with complete seriousness has enabled him to give a

28. (contd.) rectione', in ZNTW 36(1937), pp. 35 - 60. Cf. also the reviews by von Campenhausen (Deutsche Literaturzeitung 51(1930), cols., 2257 - 63), Lebon(RHE 26(1930), pp. 675 - 79) and Amann (RevSR 12(1938), pp. 238 - 55).
29. G. Wingren, Man and the Incarnation. A Study in the Biblical Theology of Irenaeus (ET, London, 1959); A. Houssiau, La christologie de saint Irénée (Louvain, 1955); A. Bengsch, Heilsgeschichte und Heilswissen. Eine Untersuchung zur Struktur und Entfaltung des theologischen Denkens im Werk "Adversus Haereses" des hl. Irenäus von Lyon (Leipzig, 1957; = Erfurter theologische Studien 3); J. Lawson, The Biblical Theology of Saint Irenaeus (London, 1948), though Lawson's approach is more akin to the old 'systematic' one.
30. A. Benoit, Saint Irénée. Introduction à l'étude de sa théologie (Paris, 1960).

valuable, balanced account that neither ignores nor denies the results of the work of scholars like Loofs, but at the same time sets that work in its proper perspective as preparatory to a genuine understanding of the theology of Irenaeus. In particular, the clear demonstration of the theological themes that provided the basis of Irenaeus's thinking, i.e., the oneness of God and of Christ, the salvation history and recapitulation, now makes it possible to describe what can, in all honesty, be called Irenaeus's theology.

Since the publication of Benoit's major introduction to the study of Irenaeus, three important works on different aspects of Irenaeus's theology have appeared, and all three show the benefits of starting from Irenaeus's declared purpose.⁽³¹⁾ They seek to show more clearly the relationship between Irenaeus's own theology and his polemical task.

31. J. Ochagavía, Visibile Patris Filius. A Study of Irenaeus's Teaching on Revelation and Tradition (Rome, 1964; = Orientalia Christiana Analecta 171); G. Joppich, Salus Carnis. Eine Untersuchung in der Theologie des hl. Irenäus von Lyon (Münsterschwarzach, 1965; = Münsterschwarzacher Studien 1); N. Brox, Offenbarung, Gnosis und gnostischer Mythos bei Irenäus von Lyon. Zur Charakteristik der Systeme (Salzburg, 1966; = Salzburger Patristische Studien 1). Two other much slighter works have also come to the attention of the present writer: L. Diess, Printemps de la théologie. Apologues grecs du II^e siècle. Irénée de Lyons (Paris, 1965; = Vivante Tradition 4); J.T. Nielsen, Adam and Christ in the Theology of Irenaeus of Lyons. An examination of the function of the Adam-Christ typology in the Adversus Haereses of Irenaeus against the background of the Gnosticism of his time (Assen, 1968; = van Gorcum's theologische Bibliotheek 40).

From all that has been written and debated about the study of Irenaeus during the last few decades, certain things about the intention of Irenaeus and his execution of his intention are now plain. In the adversus haereses, Irenaeus is pre-occupied with the polemical task outlined in the original title, The Exposure and Overthrow of the Knowledge falsely so-called. The immediate purpose of Irenaeus is served by the first two books of the work, but even in the three later books, which present a more positive affirmation of Christian truth as an answer to the Gnostic heresy, Irenaeus does not drop his polemical stance. The whole work is polemical, and for his polemical task, Irenaeus has on hand other works by contemporaries or predecessors, which he uses. The very nature of Irenaeus's task means that he is prepared to use material from other sources provided it serves his immediate purpose of refuting the Gnostic heresy. Without hesitation Irenaeus uses sources, sometimes even verbatim for quite lengthy passages, because he felt that the material used would serve his main purpose and support the point he was making. It is this fact that explains the absence of any intensive effort on Irenaeus's part to create a theological synthesis out of the material at his disposal. It also explains why the adversus haereses is not a work of systematic theology - it did not pretend to be.

The polemical task of Irenaeus must provide the starting point for the understanding of Irenaeus's presentation of his own theology, for in the main, where Gnosticism threatens the Christian gospel as Irenaeus had received it

and understood it, there he sets his own received theological tradition. Since this theology of Irenaeus is set in a polemical context, it follows as a matter of course that the points in dispute will receive the greatest attention and other aspects of Christian teaching will be ignored or simply mentioned in passing. The theology of Irenaeus, extracted as it is on the one hand from a polemical work and on the other hand from a work designed only to demonstrate the validity of the Apostolic preaching, cannot but be to some extent distorted or partial if we apply to it the categories of systematic theology.

The criteria which governed the selection of material by Irenaeus were, on the one hand, its usefulness for his task, and on the other its accredited apostolicity. Irenaeus made no attempt to be an innovator; on the contrary he accuses the Gnostics of being the innovators.⁽³²⁾ Irenaeus wishes above all things to be true to the Apostolic tradition.⁽³³⁾ This again sheds light on his use of material from other sources for the building up of his case against the Gnostics. The truth was in Christ; from him it passed to the Apostles, who handed it on within the Church down to Irenaeus's own day.⁽³⁴⁾ Quite apart

32. adv.haer. I xxviii l; H. i 220, etc.

33. See esp. adv.haer. III i lff.; H. ii 2ff.

34. Traditionem itaque Apostolorum in toto mundo manifestatam, in omni Ecclesia adest perspicere omnibus qui vera velint videre, et habemus annumerare eos qui ab

from the fact that Brox has shown that the tradition is itself an interpretation of events, the apostolic and accredited ecclesiastical material at Irenaeus's disposal, in his eyes, testifies to the validity and integrity of the Christian tradition.⁽³⁵⁾ To this extent it is correct to see in Irenaeus a witness to the tradition he had received rather than one who had his own original contribution to make to the development of theology.

Nevertheless, something else has emerged from an examination of the studies on Irenaeus. It is this: far from being merely a polemicist who gathered suitable ammunition from every available source and rolled together a jumble of disjointed fragments to be hurled at his opponents, Irenaeus knew what he was doing and where he was going. Even if the plan of the adversus haereses is not always immediately obvious, plan there is, as Benoit in particular has shown convincingly.⁽³⁶⁾ The material, borrowed or otherwise, is carefully arranged. More than this, however, must be said; the judgement of Loofs that Irenaeus was of lesser standing than had hitherto been

34. (contd.) Apostolis instituti sunt Episcopi in ecclesiis, et successiones eorum usque ad nos, qui nihil tale docuerunt, neque cognoverunt, quale ab his deliratur. adv.haer. III iii 1; H. ii 8. It must be remembered that not only did Irenaeus appeal to the Apostolic tradition, so did the Gnostics e.g. Ptolemaeus Letter to Flora (Epiphanius, Pan. 33.7) and cf. Ev.Ph. Para. 95 etc.

35. See esp. Brox, op. cit., pp. 133 - 67.

36. Benoit, op. cit., esp. pp. 158 - 96.

thought both as a writer and as a theologian has, in the work done since 1930, been shown to be wrong on both counts. The plan that the adversus haereses follows makes it clear that Irenaeus was capable of writing ably, and the recent studies have also reinstated Irenaeus as a competent theologian. This is not to say that he was a great or original thinker, but there were, however, a few major theological themes that he had made peculiarly his own and round which he gathered what he wanted to say, and by which also he was able to give something of his own stamp even to the material he borrowed. These major themes are: the oneness of God and the oneness of Christ, the divine *οἰκονομία*, and recapitulation.

It is true that all these themes, and in particular the theme of unity, play a major role in the polemic of Irenaeus. Against the Gnostic separation of the Creator and the Redeemer, Irenaeus insists that it is one God who does both. Against the Gnostic separation of Jesus and Christ, Irenaeus insists that Jesus and Christ are one and the same. Against the Gnostic devaluation of history, Irenaeus insists that the locus of man's redemption is this world, and that throughout man's history from the very moment of creation, from the very begetting of the Son in fact, God has been working out his purposes, and the climax of this, the Incarnation, takes place in a physical reality, the incarnate Word recapitulating man made after his image. Nevertheless, these themes, as Benoit has shown, lie close to Irenaeus's heart quite apart from the polemic. (37) They also provide a key

with which it is possible to solve some of the difficulties and discrepancies in the work of Irenaeus. For example, the millenarianism that plays such a large part in book V of the adversus haereses, for all that it may stem from some source of Irenaeus, fits in as the conclusion of salvation history. (38)

These same themes can also provide guidelines for the analysis of a genuine theology of Irenaeus. The weakness of the earlier syntheses of Irenaeus theology was that they imposed on the work of Irenaeus, with all its complexity of material used polemically, the categories of systematic theology and under each heading attempted to give some sort of synthesis of all that was contained in Irenaeus on the given point. To do this was to ask of Irenaeus questions that in some cases had not occurred to him, and, in any case, was a procedure that could not be justified on literary grounds, as Loofs showed. Loofs himself, however, also completely missed the heart of Irenaeus's theology. In the most recent studies of Irenaeus's theology, the coherence of his thought has once again become visible because the starting-point has been a key theme of Irenaeus, and this has set the whole question of sources used by Irenaeus back into the perspective of his overall purpose.

37. *ibid.*, pp. 203-19.

38. See Bengsch, *op.cit.*, pp. 164-73; Joppich, *op.cit.*, pp. 130f.

In a sense, therefore, the study of the theology of Irenaeus has pursued a circuitous route. We began with the attempts to present a coherent unified theology. Under the scrutiny of Loofs and others such a venture was seen to be impossible and in any case failed to take into account what Irenaeus was in fact trying to do. More recently the unity of Irenaeus's theology has again been acknowledged. This does not mean that we are back where we started. The recent studies of Irenaeus, in general, no longer see in him the unity of a systematic theologian, but rather devotion to a few key theological ideas round which all the material can be gathered, even though it is from different sources and other contexts and even though its inclusion entails some inconsistency in the detail of Irenaeus's work.

CHAPTER TWOTRADITION AND SALVATION HISTORY IN RELATION
TO THE STUDY OF IRENAEUS.

In most of the recent studies the polemic of Irenaeus provides a starting point for the discussion; for Houssiau, polemic is the foundation for an analysis of the Christology of Irenaeus; for Bengsch, the polemic provides the background against which can be seen the real clue to the theology of Irenaeus - salvation history;⁽¹⁾ for Joppich, the polemic provides part of the understanding of Irenaeus's attitude to the flesh; and for Brox, Irenaeus's attitude to revelation can be understood only in relation to Gnosticism. While, however, the polemical task of Irenaeus provides the clue to understanding his purpose, it is not necessarily the key which best provides an understanding of Irenaeus's theology. In the recent studies, one of the most prevalent themes is salvation history. Bengsch linked the polemic of Irenaeus with the theme of salvation history. Although Wingren nowhere discusses salvation history as a major theme of Irenaeus's theology, it could be said that Wingren's own arrangement of the material has strong associations with this theme. Wingren sees the key to Irenaeus's theology in the two themes of Man and the Incarnation; but the very layout of Wingren's book indicates that man is seen in his historical progression from creation, to fall, to

1. A more precise analysis of the meaning of this term and its use in the present work will be found below, pp.54-64.

redemption, to the perfect realization of the image and likeness of God in man in the final consummation. The connection between man and the Incarnation is precisely that the Incarnation is the turning point and high point of God's saving activity in the history of man. In other words, salvation history. The divine plan is also seen as of major significance for Irenaeus by Benoit, Ochagavía, Joppich and Brox. While Irenaeus's polemical task cannot be overlooked, it is probably true to say that a theological approach to Irenaeus governed by that is likely to produce a less accurate picture of Irenaeus as a theologian than an account governed by one of the central themes of Irenaeus's own theology such as salvation history. This is not to say that Irenaeus is not himself when he writes polemically, but we can be surer that we have come closer to the theology of Irenaeus himself, if we begin from one of the themes that appealed most to him, that provided him with a unifying factor for his own thoughts and a key to his handling of theological ideas.

One of the features of the theme of salvation history, a feature that is especially clear in the study by Bengsch, is the central role played by Christ. Irenaeus's salvation history is above all a christocentric salvation history, in fact, almost excessively so.⁽²⁾ The oneness of Christ is another theme that is important for Irenaeus, and it would be possible to develop a Christology of Irenaeus round that

2. See Bengsch, *op.cit.*, pp.177ff.

theme, but the role of Christ in salvation history offers a better opportunity to set the work of Christ in a distinctively Irenaeian context, while at the same time it raises the questions of the relationship of Christ to God, and of the divine and human in the one Christ, i.e. the specifically Christological questions.

If further justification were required for examining Christology in Irenaeus from the stand-point of salvation history, one would have only to look at the structure of the Demonstratio to see that Irenaeus's interest centres not primarily on the person of Christ, but on the work of God in Christ. The first half of the Demonstratio is devoted to an outline of the acts of God from the creation to the establishment of the Church,⁽³⁾ with a brief Preface on faith itself and the division of the economy in the Trinity.⁽⁴⁾ The second half of the work is a collection of proof-texts showing that what God had said in the Old Testament He would do, He had in fact accomplished through Christ.⁽⁵⁾ The work ends with a denunciation of those who do not maintain the truth.⁽⁶⁾ The whole pattern of salvation history is well summed up in the following:

This, beloved, is the preaching of the truth, and this is the manner of our salvation, and this is the way of life, announced by the prophets and ratified by Christ and handed over by the apostles and handed down by the Church in the whole world to her children.⁽⁷⁾

The line runs from the prophets to Christ to the Church.

3. Dem. 10-42.

4. Dem. 2 - 9.

5. Dem. 43 - 98.

6. Dem. 99f.

The same concern for the activity of God, not the Being of God can be illustrated from another passage of the Demonstratio:

And this is the drawing-up of our faith, the foundation of the building, and the consolidation of a way of life. God, the Father, uncreated, beyond grasp, invisible, one God the maker of all; this is the first and foremost article of our faith. But the second article is the Word of God, the Son of God, Christ Jesus our Lord, who was shown forth by the prophets according to the design of their prophecy and according to the manner in which the Father disposed; and through Him were made all things whatsoever. He also, 'in the end of times' (Dan.11.13), for the recapitulation of all things, is become a man among men, visible and tangible, in order to abolish death and bring to light life, and bring about the communion of God and man. And the third article is the Holy Spirit, through whom the prophets prophesied and the patriarchs were taught about God and the just were led in the path of justice, and who 'in the end of times' has been poured forth in a new manner upon humanity over all the earth renewing man to God.⁽⁸⁾

Even though Irenaeus is here quoting a current credal formula, the pattern of salvation history is clear and two features in particular of the Christological section, the references to the *οἰκονομία* and to recapitulation, would have found especial favour with Irenaeus.⁽⁹⁾ The whole provides a very adequate précis of the first part

7. Dem. 98.

8. Dem. 6.

9. The fact that it is Christ who recapitulates (not God as in Eph.1.10), and that he recapitulates all things is typical of Irenaeus's own understanding of recapitulation. See Benoit, op.cit., pp. 225-27.

of the Demonstratio. With regard to Christology, Christ is described by what he has done in the divine plan of salvation, not by what he is in himself.

Since salvation history is so important for Irenaeus, and since Christ is central to it, above all in his Incarnation, it follows that an analysis of the Christology of the works of Irenaeus done on the basis of Christ's role in salvation history has a good chance of representing what may fairly be called the Christology of Irenaeus.

This does not avoid, of course, the two problems with which we began: the polemical nature of Irenaeus's major extant work, and the presence in it of material from other sources. Irenaeus expounded his Christology in a polemical setting and part of his task demanded a direct answer to the interpretations of the person and work of Christ advanced by the Gnostics. It also demanded Irenaeus's answer to the Gnostic understanding of the development of the world and the return of the spiritual élite to the Pleroma from which they came. Irenaeus's answer to this second point is the salvation history, in which all things take their place in the divine plan which covers the entire life of man from creation to the consummation. Within this framework Irenaeus also presented his answer to the Gnostic interpretation of Christ; it is one and the same Christ who is active in the whole divine economy of salvation, and this one Christ is also one with man in the sense that he really shares in the life of man so that there is one Christ Jesus both God and man and not one

Christ and another Jesus as the Gnostics maintain. (10)

All that has just been said lays the foundation for a clearer understanding of the Christology of Irenaeus, but to assess it fully requires something more than that; Irenaeus's Christology must be set against the wider contemporary background of the second Century AD. Already we have seen above that the approach from the point of view of salvation history, far from beginning with Irenaeus, is embedded in the credal formula which he uses. (11) There the emphasis lies on the activity rather than on the Being of Christ. The Christocentric salvation history of Irenaeus has its own history in the second Century AD and back to the New Testament itself.

Bengsch has already sketched the outline of the possible development of this Christocentric salvation history from the New Testament to Irenaeus. (12) Bengsch sees the possible origin in the Pauline emphasis on history and God's *μυστήριον*; with this is combined the Johannine emphasis on the Incarnation and the New Testament idea of God's time. Irenaeus has not simply adopted these ideas but has developed them in his own characteristic way, especially with regard to the Christocentricity of salvation history and the relation of this to the idea

10. A full discussion of this constitutes the major part of the present work.

11. Dem. 6; cf. adv. haer. I x 1; M. i 91

12. Bengsch, op.cit., pp. 195 - 207, on the immediate second Century sources of Irenaeus, pp. 207-29 on Irenaeus and the New Testament.

of man's development and education.⁽¹³⁾ In the second Century the Christocentric Heilsordnung can be seen in Ignatius of Antioch, Pseudo-Barnabas, Justin Martyr and possibly Theophilus of Antioch, though Irenaeus rejects the speculation of the last two. This is one part of the wider contemporary setting of Irenaeus: the line of tradition which Irenaeus acknowledges and in which he consciously stands. It would be strange indeed if Irenaeus himself had no theological connection with that tradition from which he refused to deviate and which he regards himself as handing on as purely as it had come down to him.⁽¹⁴⁾ This, then, must be taken into account in any attempt to assess the Christology of Irenaeus.

Alongside this tradition that forms part of the contemporary background to Irenaeus we must set another factor, Gnosticism. To Irenaeus Gnosticism was a hated opponent. To him the Gnostics were intruders, the degenerate progeny of Simon Magus; they were outside the gospel but found it convenient to use, or rather to misuse certain aspects of the Church's teaching, twisting it and perverting it to suit their own ends. They asked questions which went far beyond what man had a right to ask, and

13. Benoit (op.cit., pp. 227-32) does not consider that the theme of evolution or progress is a fundamental Irenaeian theme, since it is taken more seriously in Irenaeus's sources than in Irenaeus himself.

14. adv.haer. III i 1; H. ii 2; III iii 1; H. ii 8; III v 1; H. ii 18.

proposed answers to their own questions that were utter and complete blasphemy. To Irenaeus, the Gnostics appear as innovators never happy unless dreaming up some new theory or speculation.⁽¹⁵⁾ We are not concerned with the accuracy of Irenaeus's assessment of the Gnostics of his own day; the point is that he saw them as an external threat, not as an internal cancer. Yet, as Brox has shown, in spite of what Irenaeus says of Gnostic origins in pagan philosophy, he is aware that the Gnostics have fallen away from the truth, that is that they wished to be part of the Church, and Irenaeus is engaged not only in fighting off the enemy but in drawing up the lines of division between them.⁽¹⁶⁾

Before we go any further it is as well to point out that we are concerned here with Gnosticism as distinct from Gnosis,⁽¹⁷⁾ that is, we are concerned primarily with the developed Gnostic systems that are attacked by Irenaeus. The origins of Gnosticism are obscure. Gnosticism as met in its second Century form has many close affinities with Christianity, and from the second century to the nineteenth century was regarded by the Church as a Christian heresy.

15. See esp. Bengsch, op.cit., pp. 6 - 16; Brox, op.cit., esp. pp. 22 - 26.

16. See esp. Brox, op.cit., pp. 22 - 35.

17. The clarification of terms was one of the useful gains of the Messina Colloquium of 1966. See U.Bianchi, 'Proposal for a terminological and conceptual agreement with regard to the theme of the Colloquium', in Le Origini dello Gnosticismo, ed. U.Bianchi (Leiden, 1967;= Studies in the History of Religions: Supplements to Numen vol. XII), pp. xxvi - xxix.

Harnack indeed described it as 'the acute hellenization of Christianity'.⁽¹⁸⁾ The investigations of the History-of-Religions school made it clear, however, that Gnosticism shows affinities with a number of other religions and philosophical tendencies of antiquity, and similarities were found between Gnosticism and Hellenistic philosophy, and religious movements of Iran, Babylon, Persia and Egypt. More recently, the obvious similarities between Gnosticism and Judaism have been studied in some detail.⁽¹⁹⁾ Elements within Gnosticism can be traced to these and other related fields, but it has become increasingly clear that while signs of Gnosis can be detected in these areas, and indeed in the New Testament itself, undisputed evidence for the origins of Gnosticism in any one of these areas is lacking.⁽²⁰⁾

18. A. von Harnack, History of Dogma, ET (London, 1897), vol. I, p. 226.

19. One has only to consider the frequency with which reference was made at the Messina Colloquium to the relationship between Gnosticism and Judaism. A clear warning must be sounded, however, against too readily tracing Gnosticism to Judaism. See e.g. H.F. Weiss, 'Einige Randbemerkungen zum Problem des Verhältnisses von "Judentum" und "Gnosis"', in OLZ 64(1969), cols. 540 - 51.

20. See e.g., K. Rudolph, 'Gnosis und Gnostizismus, ein Forschungsbericht', in Th.R 36(1971), pp. 30 - 61, 89 - 119. Also, on the problem of pre-Christian Gnosis and Gnosticism see E.M. Yamauchi, Pre-Christian Gnosticism. A Survey of the proposed Evidences (London, 1973).

One of the difficulties is that Gnosticism in its developed form is syncretistic, and this raises the awkward question as to how far the elements taken from other sources were outright gnostic, or merely capable of a gnostic interpretation, or even not gnostic at all, prior to their adoption and adaptation by the Gnostics of the second century.⁽²¹⁾ Undoubtedly Gnosticism was syncretistic, and yet it was not simply syncretism. Bultmann has expressed the point well:

Since it (sc. Gnosticism) appropriated all sorts of mythological and philosophical traditions for its expression, we may call it a synthetic phenomenon. Yet it would be wrong to regard it only as such. All its forms, its mythology and theology, arise from 'a definite attitude to life and an interpretation of human existence derived therefrom.'⁽²²⁾

In other words Gnosticism is not to be equated with the sum of its parts even if these could be satisfactorily identified.

21. See especially the remarks of R.McL. Wilson, Gnosis and the New Testament (Oxford, 1968), pp. 18 - 20, and on the special problem in this connection in the New Testament itself, *ibid.*, pp. 31 - 59. Cf. also the insistence of Hans Jonas that what matters is not the individual words and concepts but the context in which they are used. H. Jonas, 'Response to G. Quispel's "Gnosticism and the New Testament" in The Bible in Modern Scholarship, ed. J.P. Hyatt (London, 1966), pp. 279 - 93, esp. 279 - 86.
22. R.Bultmann, Primitive Christianity in its Contemporary Setting (ET; London, 1960), P.193. It should be observed that Bultmann is talking about die Gnosis, which is a much wider concept than the word Gnosticism would indicate. At the end of the above passage Bultmann quotes

The question that concerns us here is the relationship between Christianity and Gnosticism, and in particular the legitimacy of considering the Gnostics as part of the essential background to Irenaeus's own theology. That there is a close relationship is not open to dispute, but so far as origins are concerned a major point must be considered: to what extent is it legitimate to continue to regard Gnosticism as a derivative of Christianity? Or to put it another way: is Gnosticism to be regarded as an internal cancer which the Church in time isolated and then removed, or as in part an internal cancer and in part a genuine foreign body that in time showed its true character? While for most of the history of the Church the undisputed theory was that Gnosticism was essentially a Christian heresy, this finds little support today, being associated at present almost exclusively with Mlle. Pétrement. In an important article⁽²³⁾ written after the Messina Colloquium of 1966, Mlle. Pétrement presents her case for rejecting the current tendency to seek the origins of Gnosticism in Judaism and for regarding Gnosticism as an offshoot of Christianity.

Mlle. Pétrement begins by describing briefly some of the major concepts of Gnosticism in its second-century form

22. (contd.) from Hans Jonas whose Gnosis und spätantiker Geist was a pioneering work in this approach to Gnosticism.
23. S. Pétrement, 'Le Colloque de Messine et le problème du gnosticisme', in Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale, 72(1967), pp. 344-73. Cf. id. 'La notion de gnosticisme', in Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale, 65(1960), pp. 385 - 421.

and draws attention to the fact that many of these traits are found in a less-accentuated form in ordinary Christianity. She then, so far as the scanty evidence will allow, traces the development of Gnosticism from the faint echoes in the New Testament to a decisive break with Christianity which she locates in the middle of the second century, when Gnosticism 'appeared to evolve . . . towards a fusion with non-christian teachings, towards a transformation into a universal religion and a weakening of the historical bonds with Christianity.'⁽²⁴⁾ She then considers in turn the ideas of Bousset and Reitzenstein on Gnosticism as syncretism, of Jonas on Gnosticism as a distinct religion, of Grant and others on the Jewish origins of Gnosticism, and of Bianchi on Gnostic dualism as a universal phenomenon. In so far as the origins of Gnosticism are concerned, Mlle. Pétrement has two main objections to the theories of those who reject a Christian origin: Theories of a non-christian origin are impossible 'without some inversions of chronology';⁽²⁵⁾ such theories are also weakened by a desire to prove that the non-christian elements represent the essential elements of Gnosticism. By the first objection, Mlle. Pétrement wishes to indicate that those who reject a Christian origin for Gnosticism are to a greater or less degree guilty of reading back the doctrines and forms of developed and even late Gnosticism into the period of its origins. The force of the second objection lies in a consideration of whether the Christian forms present in Gnosticism are fundamental

24. art. cit., p. 350

25. ibid., p. 351

or peripheral to Gnosticism. Having rejected all alternative theories, Mlle. Pétrement restates the case for the Christian origin of Gnosticism. She maintains that her position is supported by the tradition of the Church up to the late nineteenth century, and she points out that the Fathers of the Church would have welcomed any opportunity to state that the Gnostics were complete aliens. She also maintains that the theory of a Christian origin best explains a number of important features of Gnosticism, notably the criticism of Judaism, the opposition between God and the world, the contempt for the powers of the world, the fact that no Gnostic texts can be dated earlier than Christianity, the slow development of Gnosticism during the first century AD and its full manifestation only in the second century. In short, she concludes that 'the Gnostic revolution is only an extreme form of the Christian revolution.' (26)

In the final part of her article Mlle. Pétrement attacks some of the arguments advanced against the idea of the Christian origin of Gnosticism. To the argument that Gnosticism and Christianity are essentially different she counters with examples in which Christian and Gnostic doctrines are similar, even with regard to eschatology, the divine spark in man, salvation as knowledge of one's true nature, speculation on creation, and docetism. The differences are more of degree than of kind. She then attacks some of the arbitrary assumptions of those who

seek the origins of Gnosticism outside of Christianity:³³
that Simon Magus was Gnostic first then Christian; that
Paul's opponents in Corinth and Colossae were Gnostics;
that the Johannine Epistles specifically attacked docetism;
that the notices of Epiphanius and Clement of Alexandria
can be taken as evidence of non-Christian gnostic sects;
that the Ophites were non-Christian Gnostics; that the
Apocalypse of Adam from Codex V of Nag Hammadi shows no
traces of Christian influence; that the Epistle of
Eugnostos from Nag Hammadi is also non-Christian and that
the appearance of much of the material of the Epistle in
the Sophia Jesu Christi in the mouth of Christ is an
attempt to Christianize what is essentially non-Christian;
that Mandaeism is independent of Christianity. The actual
suggestions advanced by Mlle. Pétrement are less important
here than the fact that she has challenged some of the
assumptions of others and shown that to a greater or less
degree these questions are all still open. In the third
place Mlle. Pétrement suggests three hypotheses that would
bear further examination in the light of the chronology
that she accepts: that the syncretism of Gnosticism may
itself be something that grew and not simply something
that was there from the beginning; that pagan 'gnoses'
may be the result of Christian influence on paganism;
that some of the Gnostic literature may represent the
attempts of Christians to present their ideas under a
disguised form, as was done with some Jewish literature
(the Sibylline Oracles, the Ascension of Isaiah, etc.).
Fourthly, Mlle. Pétrement considers the confusion that

surrounds the terms 'Gnosis' and Gnosticism', and the problems that ensue. Finally she refers to her own explanation given at Messina of the possible Christian origin of the Gnostic myth of the seven archons.

All the points made by Mlle. Pétrement are important but it is very doubtful that they add up to a convincing case for the Christian origin of Gnosticism. First of all in the area of similarities between Christianity and Gnosticism there is what Hans Jonas calls the matter of context. 'It is the meaning context, taken in its wholeness and integrity, which matters, and not the traffic in single symbols, figures, and names.'⁽²⁷⁾ While Mlle. Pétrement is not at all guilty of lifting minutiae out of context and making inappropriate comparisons her similarities between Gnosticism and Christianity must still be set in an even wider context than she adopts. For example, there is indeed a docetic element in some early Christian Christology, but in the last resort this is peripheral to the general opinion of the early Church, whereas, in Gnosticism, docetism is the norm from which some documents seem to depart. However, even if the similarities are conceded, there is another important problem. Hans Jonas again has said this:

A Gnosticism without a fallen god, without benighted

27. In his article in The Bible in Modern Scholarship.

See above, n. 289. Quotation from p. 286.

creator and sinister creation, without alien soul, cosmic captivity and acosmic salvation, without the self-redeeming of the Deity - in short: a Gnosis (28) without divine tragedy will not meet specifications.

This is something far removed from 'an extreme form of the Christian revolution'. Jonas is talking about Gnosticism in its fully developed form, but to substantiate her theory Mlle. Pétrement would have to demonstrate that this idea of a divine tragedy could originate from no other source than Christianity. Clearly Christianity made a significant contribution, but in the last resort it is as difficult to derive this tragic world-view from Christianity as it is to derive it from Judaism.

A second difficulty arises over the concept of chronology. There is no denying that some scholars, in their search for parallels, have not been consistently careful to avoid reading back into an earlier age things that are clear only at a later stage. Nevertheless, two points should be made: first that no concept springs into existence in its fully-developed form with no roots in what precedes it. This, however, in connection with Gnosticism, still leaves as a completely open question the matter of the point at which Gnosis actually becomes Gnosticism, and the two must not be confused. The second point concerns Mlle. Pétrement's own chronology for the development of Gnosticism. It is too neat and tidy to speak of the development from Gnosis to Gnosticism within

Christianity, to the expulsion of Gnosticism by the Church and the involvement of Gnosticism with pagan and other syncretistic ideas, so that the more 'pagan' a Gnostic work the later it must come in the development. There is no reason why the relationships should not be a great deal more complex, with various Gnostic groups of the same age standing in closer or more remote relationship to Christianity and any other of the areas that appear to have contributed to the development of Gnosticism.⁽²⁹⁾ Furthermore, the argument tends to be inconclusive since a work exhibiting 'pagan' Gnosticism may indeed represent Gnosticism that has moved away from Christianity, but it may equally well represent Gnosticism that has not yet assimilated Christian ideas. The question can only be left open or decided on quite different grounds.

As for the tradition accepted by the Church for most of its history that Gnosticism was a Christian heresy, it is quite true that men like Irenaeus admitted that the Gnostics were errant Christians, but they also blamed philosophy for starting the corruption. This is no doubt in part simply refusing to acknowledge that the Church had a hand in producing Gnosticism, but it is also more than that; whether the early Fathers were right or wrong to blame philosophy is not the point, what is significant

29. See e.g. Wilson, Gnosis and the New Testament, pp.23-27.

is that by this action they showed that they felt that, in Gnosticism, there was a cuckoo in the nest. Allotting the blame, as well as being an admission of guilt, can also be an attempt to explain something for which no guilt is felt to attach to oneself.

A further weakness in Mlle. Pétrement's case is her wish to trace the origins of Gnosticism to one source only - Christianity. She admits that Gnosis, as distinct from Gnosticism, was wide-spread.⁽³⁰⁾ Without wishing to suggest that Gnosis leads inevitably to Gnosticism, is it not possible that Gnosticism may have not one root but several, not only in the material it borrowed, but also in its fundamental concepts?⁽³¹⁾

Finally, if as Mlle. Pétrement suggests Gnosticism is 'an extreme form of the Christian revolution', would one not expect it to be preoccupied with Christian themes? Christian themes are found in Gnosticism, but they are not the central themes of Christianity that would lend weight to the argument.

None of this means that the Christian influence on the growth and even origins of Gnosticism may be ignored, but it must be set among the other factors that contributed to its development. At all costs we must avoid the over-simplified picture, as though there were a readily identifiable phenomenon known as Gnosticism

30. art.cit., p. 371

31. See e.g. Wilson, Gnosis and the New Testament, p.27.

growing up alongside an equally readily identifiable phenomenon known as Christianity, with some interchange of ideas taking place. The process by which the Church came to an understanding and definition of itself and its teachings was a long and slow one. In the first few centuries of our era the Church thought, weighed and sifted a multitude of ideas in order to explain its faith to itself and the world. At the same time Gnosticism was taking on a clearer and clearer form and its relationship to the Church varied not only chronologically as the Church drew the boundaries between acceptable and unacceptable interpretations of the gospel more and more sharply, but quite apart from chronology the attitude of Gnostic writers to Christ and the gospel ranged from the mere use of Christian terms and names to a serious attempt to interpret the gospel albeit in Gnostic terms, and there is no guarantee that chronology was a co-relative factor in these attitudes. Gnosticism is not a single system and the Christian content varies from virtually nothing to almost the entirety. In works such as the Apocryphon of John the Christian element is a thin veneer of little or no significance for the meaning of the work. On the other hand, in works such as The Gospel of Truth, the Letter to Rheginus, the Apocryphal Letter of James, etc., there is a very real attempt to present some understanding of specifically Christian things such as the crucifixion and resurrection and the person of Christ. (32)

While there is no conclusive case for finding the origins of Gnosticism in Christianity, at those points where Gnosticism tries to interpret Christianity rather than simply use its terms it is not possible to see it as an outsider intruding on Christianity as Irenaeus would like to see it; rather it must be set alongside the rest of the second century tradition as another part of the total background to the Christology of Irenaeus. To the extent that Gnosticism has attempted to interpret the person and work of Christ, it belongs within the Christian tradition to be considered with the other interpretations of the person and work of Christ that grew up in the first and second centuries, but which the Church felt compelled in the end to reject as inadequate expressions of its faith in Jesus Christ. This rejection took place within the Church as people like Irenaeus drew the lines of division between themselves and the Gnostics.

What has been said in the preceding paragraph has importance for the question of the development of Christian doctrine as a whole. The Christian tradition does not have a simple, single line of development from the New Testament down into the third and fourth centuries. One has only to consider the New Testament itself to see the falsity of any such simplistic idea; although all the New Testament writings agree that God's definitive act has taken place in Jesus Christ, there are a number of different Christologies represented in the 27 books. The letters of Paul, the works of John, the synoptic gospels, the Epistle to

the Hebrews, etc., all have some individuality in their respective Christologies. The second century AD is even more complex if one takes into account all the material inspired in one way or another by the Christian faith. The apocryphal gospels and acts and other writings attest a wide range of thought, not least in the realm of Christology. All this took place within the Church. The impulse to theological writing was a continuous process of meditation and sifting and argument that led to the gradual realization that some writings were inconsistent with the knowledge of the Church about the events of the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, and inconsistent with the Church's experience of redemption through Christ. Initially, the Church had no theological criterion other than its memory and experience with which to sift the thinking and writing that was going on; from its own reflection the Church had to forge its own criteria as it went.

This inevitably leads us to a brief consideration of the relationship between orthodoxy and heresy in the early Church as part of the necessary background to an understanding of the desirable scope of the context in which to place the Christology of Irenaeus. In the field of orthodoxy and heresy the fundamental work was Walter Bauer's Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum.⁽³³⁾ Bauer challenged the theory that

33. (Tübingen, 1934) References are to the English translation of the second edition by G. Strecker: W. Bauer, Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity, ed.

had prevailed from the second century to the nineteenth that orthodoxy is always prior to heresy; that is, the assumption that Christ had taught the apostles the pure gospel and the apostles and their successors in the Church had carried that same pure gospel to the world, and the world had moved from unbelief to belief, and, only as a third stage, to heresy. Writing of the assumptions of the fathers of the early Church Bauer observes:

There is scarcely the faintest notion anywhere that unbelief might be changed directly into what the church calls false belief. No, where there is heresy, orthodoxy must have preceded.⁽³⁴⁾

Bauer attempted to show that in at least some areas of the early Church, heresy was prior to orthodoxy - or rather, since the terms 'orthodoxy' and 'heresy' suggest a fairly rigid classification, that in some areas the initial form taken by Christianity was one which differed from what in time was to become the orthodoxy of the catholic church.⁽³⁵⁾ Bauer examined the situation in Edessa, Egypt, the centres associated with Ignatius of Antioch, and Rome, and concluded that in all but the last heresy preceded orthodoxy, and that the establishment of orthodoxy elsewhere was largely the result of the authority and influence of Rome. This is not the place to examine Bauer's thesis in detail;⁽³⁶⁾ suffice it to say

33. (contd.) R.Kraft and G.Krodel (Philadelphia, 1971).

34. op.cit., p. xxiii.

35. ibid., Introduction.

36. G.Strecker added to the second German edition of

that there has been general acceptance of the view that the relationship between developing orthodoxy and developing heresy in the early Church was far more complex than the picture presented by the Church fathers and generally accepted down to the nineteenth century.

It is easy, and dangerous, to look back post eventum and trace the line of orthodoxy from the New Testament through the second century and on into the third. From our point of view it is not too difficult to see what is orthodox and what heterodox, but in the situation itself this was by no means clear. The picture of a clearly-defined, defensive orthodoxy fighting off all opponents is quite inaccurate. At the time, it would appear more like a profusion of conflicting interpretations all claiming to be valid. Widely differing views of Christ and his work existed side by side and only as the Church (in the widest sense of that word) went about weighing and sifting and judging the ideas that were continually

36. (contd.) Bauer's work an appendix in which he discussed in some detail the critical reception of the original edition of the book; in the English translation the appendix (pp. 286 - 316) has been revised and expanded by R.A. Kraft. All the major reviews of the original edition are considered, as are the more extensive works by H.E.W. Turner (The Pattern of Christian Truth - see below, pp 44ff.) and A.A.T. Ehrhardt ('Christianity before the Apostles' Creed', in HThR 55(1962), pp. 73 - 119; = id., The Framework of the New Testament Stories, Manchester, 1964, pp. 151-199), and also more recent discussions of the problem of orthodoxy and heresy, and reactions to the second German edition of Bauer's work.

being put forward did there emerge on the one side an official ecclesiastical orthodoxy and on the other side various heresies and a clear dividing line between the two.

Before leaving this matter, consideration must be given to the question of the criteria by which the Church 'weighed, sifted and judged' the traditions that were developing. For Irenaeus the answer was quite clear: the criterion is the apostolic tradition as guaranteed by the succession of bishops from the apostles who were taught by Christ himself.⁽³⁷⁾ For our purpose, however, this only begs the question of the origin of the apostolic tradition. Bauer called in question the assumption that heresy is the last stage in the chain: unbelief, right belief, heterodox belief, and the assumption that the apostolic tradition stems by an unbroken thread from Christ himself must also inevitably come in question. The matter of criteria requires further clarification, for, as we have suggested above, the Church had to create its own criteria as it sought to distinguish the valid interpretations of the faith from the invalid. Closer examination shows that what is really at issue here is whether or not orthodoxy had some distinctive features that inevitably marked it off from all other traditions. Was it in any sense natural that an orthodoxy should emerge with the characteristics that it showed by the end of the second century? Bauer

37. Irenaeus, adv. haer. III i ff.; H. ii 3ff.

does not raise this question in this form; for him the picture is more one of a number of distinct theological tendencies, one of which (the Roman) becomes dominant and therefore the orthodoxy of the catholic Church - a process closely bound up with the question of the Church's authority. Did orthodoxy in fact have anything else on its side? In the Bampton Lectures for 1954⁽³⁸⁾ H.E.W. Turner maintained that it did.

Like Bauer, Turner rejects the 'classical' view of the origins of heresy on the grounds that it is not consistent with the diversity of opinion in early Christianity.⁽³⁹⁾ But his solution to the problem does not at all involve placing all the numerous traditions of early Christianity on the same level and arguing that one became 'orthodoxy' through the influence of the centre in which it was found. Indeed with regard to this thesis Turner considers that 'perhaps the root difficulty is that Bauer fails to attain an adequate view of the nature of orthodoxy For the nature of orthodoxy is richer and more varied than Bauer himself allows. Its underlying basis lies in the religious facts of Christianity itself.'⁽⁴⁰⁾ Turner holds to what he calls 'the essential autonomy of orthodoxy'.⁽⁴¹⁾

38. H.E.W. Turner, The Pattern of Christian Truth. A Study in the Relations between Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Early Church (London, 1954; = The Bampton Lectures 1954)

39. Turner, op. cit., pp. 3 - 16.

40. *ibid.*, p. 80

41. *ibid.*, p. 478.

Heresy is related to orthodoxy in a number of ways,⁽⁴²⁾ but throughout, there is a clear difference of approach to be seen in orthodoxy's handling of its material from that seen in heresy. Orthodoxy upholds the totality of the Scriptural revelation against the selective exegesis of the heretics; orthodoxy maintains an open tradition against the secret tradition of the Gnostics; orthodoxy makes a genuine attempt to use reason to express the truths of the gospel, but heresy, especially in Gnosticism, shows 'more conclusive evidence for the conversion of logic into logistics'.⁽⁴³⁾ Above all, there stands behind orthodoxy the lex orandi, by which Turner means 'a relatively full and fixed experimental grasp of what was involved religiously in being a Christian It might, for example, take the form of a broad experimental grasp rather than a formal or stylized law, but it formed the instinctive basis for that exercise of Christian common sense which enabled the Church to reject interpretations of her Faith and dilutions of her life even before she possessed formal standards of belief.'⁽⁴⁴⁾

Turner is clearly right to insist that such things as the New Testament canon, the Rule of Faith, the lists of episcopal succession and the Creeds are not simply the

42. *ibid.*, ch. 3.

43. *ibid.*, p.230

44. *ibid.*, p. 28; cf. pp. 575f.

product of the polemical enterprise of the Church as it sought to establish the orthodox tradition over against the Gnostics, Marcion and other groups, and he has made a very strong case for the autonomy of orthodoxy from the period of Irenaeus on, and the evidence of Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria and Origen, etc., upholds this. It is not so clear, however, that he has proved his point for the period before Irenaeus. Turner himself admits that orthodoxy developed and only gradually articulated the distinction between itself and heterodoxy, but the essential autonomy is always there. The following passage summarises well Turner's position:

Nor was the Church's response to heresy entirely uniform; it proved capable of development in the light of the progress which was made towards doctrinal precision during the period. In the second century it approximates to an instinctive feeling, 'This is not the Faith'; in the third it becomes a matter of more acute theological apprehension, 'This is not the fullness of the Christian tradition as we have received it'; but in the fourth it reaches the stage of an articulate theology which is beginning to receive a defined form, 'This is not the doctrine of the Church as we are labouring to expound and define it'. Yet at every stage the response to heresy is made in the light of the religious realities received by the Church and revealed by the One God (45)

We are concerned here only with the second century and there the question must be asked: How clear-cut a division can be obtained on the basis of an instinctive feeling? Again,

45. *ibid.*, p.148

46. *ibid.*, p.476.

speaking of the variety of theological traditions within orthodoxy itself Turner says:

These tradition-lines appear to have evolved at their own speed and in their own way. The sole theological criterion by which they were to be judged was their adequacy to express in all its fullness the religious tradition to which the Church was heir.⁽⁴⁶⁾

The same thing applies to the heterodox traditions, but it is only as the full religious tradition is itself articulated that the lines of distinction become clear and the two things can be treated as independent entities. The essential differences may well be there from the beginning, but until they are spelled out from the late second century on there can be no clear-cut line of division between orthodoxy and heresy.⁽⁴⁷⁾ Irenaeus

47. The essential circularity of Turner's argument is quite clear in the above quotation: traditions are to be judged by the Tradition. This approach was strongly criticised by Helmut Koester: 'On the other hand, the search for theological criteria cannot be avoided by means of a retreat into dogmatic or religious propositions. Such propositions often attempt to fill the gaps and bridge the inconsistencies in the history of orthodoxy by postulating a primitive orthodox church which concealed its true beliefs in certain practices and institutions, and in the - theologically mute - "lex orandi". Any such construction bars further questioning, since it takes for granted that which is actually the challenging, still unresolved task of the theological quest.' H. Koester, 'GNOMAI DIAPHOROI. The Origin and Nature of Diversification in the History of of Early Christianity', in Trajectories through Early

himself must spell out the canons of good exegesis and the terms of the true tradition, and it is in spelling these out that the lines are drawn between orthodoxy and heresy. It is precisely because the autonomy of orthodoxy was not immediately apparent that Irenaeus took up his pen. In the period before this work of division was undertaken we have no choice but to treat all the material as part of one complex tradition.

The same problem can be discerned in Turner's tendency to divide the traditions of the early Church into two camps, orthodoxy and heresy. (48) In fairness to Turner he concedes the existence of a 'penumbra' between the two camps and a certain amount of fluidity, but this in itself only serves to justify the contention that there were initially no defined lines of demarcation between the two, until the Church drew them as it saw the weaknesses inherent in some elements within the whole tradition. But

- 47.(contd) Christianity, ed. J.M. Robinson and H. Koester (Philadelphia, 1971), pp. 114-57, quotation from p. 116. The article also appeared in HTHR 58 (1965), pp. 279 - 318.
48. The tendency to heighten the distinctiveness of the two camps appears at a number of points: In a review, J.N. Sanders observed that Turner can justify the distinction between orthodox and heretical methods of exegesis only by special pleading (JTS n.s. 7(1956), pp. 119-23). So too Turner can only deal with the problem of sharp distinctions acutely raised by a work such as Ptolemaeus's Letter to Flora by resorting to such descriptions of it as 'Gnosticism . . . on its

again, until the lines are drawn we can only deal with the whole tradition.

A recent example of the extent to which scholars have become aware of the diversity in early Christianity may be seen in the picture presented by J.M. Robinson and H. Koester in their Trajectories through Early Christianity.⁽⁴⁹⁾ Even though, on occasion, one would wish to draw the outlines of the individual traditions and trajectories within early Christianity with a more hesitant line than the authors adopt, the primary picture of variety is undeniably correct. It can only be agreed that 'the distinctions between canonical and noncanonical, orthodox and heretical are obsolete. The classical "Introduction to the New Testament" has lost its scientific justification. One can only speak of a "History of Early Christian Literature".⁽⁵⁰⁾

48.(contd.) best behaviour' (op.cit.,p.180) and 'well calculated to allay possible orthodox fears' (ibid., p.203).

49. Philadelphia, 1971.

50. H. Koester, 'The Intention and Scope of Trajectories', the Conclusion to Robinson and Koester, Trajectories through Early Christianity, p.270. A similar point was made by Hans-Dietrich Altendorf when he maintained that 'man die damals sich vollziehende geistige Auseinandersetzung nicht als species in einem vorhandenen genus der Ketzerbekämpfung versteht, sondern als historisches Phänomen sui generis' (H.-D. Altendorf, 'Zum Stichwort: Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum', in ZKG 80(1969), pp.61-74, quotation from p.74).

In this, we have rejected Turner's concept of a lex orandi as being too much a convenient screen behind which the traditional orthodoxy can hide without fear of attack. On the other hand, our acceptance of a wide diversity of theological opinion in early Christianity must not be allowed to suggest either that the defining of boundaries between acceptable and unacceptable theology was a task undertaken only in the second half of the second century AD, or that orthodoxy was simply 'the most successful heresy'.⁽⁵¹⁾ Paul, John, Clement, Ignatius, Justin and Irenaeus, to name only the most obvious, were all conscious of defending the gospel as they saw it against dilution and distortion. But behind these, there stands not some lex orandi but the irreducible heart of the gospel. The Church did have its memory and experience: the memory of Jesus of Nazareth and the experience of

50. (contd.) One may compare with that the picture presented by L. Goppelt in his Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times (ET, London, 1970), esp. pp. 123-35, in which the diversity is also emphasised. Cf. also A. A. T. Ehrhardt, 'Christianity before the Apostle's Creed', in The Framework of the New Testament Stories, (Manchester, 1964), pp. 151-199 (= HThR 55 (1962), pp. 73 - 119).

51. L. Goppelt, Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times (ET, London, 1970), p. 169, quoting from M. Werner, Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas.

salvation by God through that same Jesus. From this paradox stemmed the fundamental problems with which the Church has had to wrestle always, and most of all in the first five centuries of its life: If God redeems us in Christ Jesus, then (a) what is Christ's relationship to God and (b) what is the relationship of the divine to the human in Christ?

The implications of the paradox were not all seen at once, and the attempts to explain and understand what the Church had received produced a number of differing traditions developing along different lines. All were genuine attempts to explain 'redemption through Jesus'. The judgment that this or that tradition was orthodox could not be made at once, for no tradition had an unquestioned right to be the sole interpreter of the Church's memory and experience.⁽⁵²⁾ In fact each tradition must have had its own lex orandi, and what was acceptable interpretation here was not acceptable there. The significance of attempts to explain or understand the paradox was not always immediately grasped and even if grasped was not at once seen as a fundamental distortion

52. Irenaeus made an appeal to the ecclesiastical tradition which preserved the apostolic preaching in its truth (e.g. adv.haer. III i ff.), but the Gnostics themselves also appealed to the Apostolic tradition e.g. Ptolemaeus in his Letter to Flora (Epiphanius Pan. 33.7) cf. Ev.Ph. Para. 95.

of the gospel. Furthermore, even in the light of history it is impossible to classify clearly some of the traditions into orthodox and unorthodox, for within each individual tradition there were some elements that later were to be seen as orthodox and others as unorthodox. In itself each tradition was not unambiguous.⁽⁵³⁾ It is only as the significance and implications of the paradox are explored that the developing traditions begin to crystallize into those that maintain the paradox and those that in some way or other dissolve it. If one were to say anything about the inevitable emergence of an orthodox ecclesiastical tradition, it would simply be that the future would in the end lie with an explanation of the paradox that did not ignore or explain away the reality of the redemption by God and the location of the redemptive event in the historical person of Jesus.

While, then, Irenaeus would turn in his grave at the very idea, it is important to set the Christology of Irenaeus, particularly in its form of the Christocentric salvation history, in the broad perspective of the second century, including in that frame not only the known components of the tradition of Irenaeus, but also the Gnostic interpretations of Christ and his role in the divine economy.

53. One has only to consider, e.g. the debate over such works as The Gospel of Thomas or the Odes of Solomon, and over the work of Origen in the fourth century.

Two points remain to be considered before we turn to an examination of the works of the second century. The first is the limitation of the discussion of Gnosticism to the Valentinian school. There are a number of reasons for this. The primary reason is the very extent of the Gnostic literature and its relationship to the central theme of this study: the Christocentric Salvation History of Irenaeus. Although Gnosticism was generally hostile or indifferent to history, and so to the idea of salvation history, there is nevertheless in some of the Gnostic writings the idea of a divine plan that is worked out in the events of the Pleroma and of redemption, i.e. a salvation drama. In that plan Christ sometimes has a role; this would justify the examination of the Gnostic writings of the second century. To deal with the concept of the salvation drama in all the extant Gnostic literature even of the second century would require an extensive volume in itself. Since then some limitation seemed necessary to the scope of the present study, the Valentinian Gnostic system was chosen because there is a reasonably extensive body of literature that belongs to the system; in it a genuine attempt is made to interpret the person and work of Christ; there is a clear scheme of a salvation drama in which Christ plays a significant role; finally, the Valentinians are the Gnostics with whom Irenaeus is most concerned.

The second point is this: Although several scholars, notably Bengsch and Benoit, have pointed out the

importance of salvation history in the theology of Irenaeus, the term salvation history itself must be defined more closely in connection with the present study before we proceed any further. As J.Reumann has said, 'the term "Heilsgeschichte" reminds one a little of the state of affairs in Israel when there was no king: everyone understands it "as seems right in his own eyes".' (54) We have no intention here of entering into the debate over the precise meaning of the term in the context of the New Testament nor of discussing whether the concept is central or peripheral to the theology of the New Testament. Our task here is solely to define the term so that it may be clearly understood what we mean by salvation history in relation to Irenaeus and his background.

The scholar most often associated with the concept of salvation history is Oskar Cullmann and in his Christ and Time (55) he had this to say about Irenaeus:

It is also no accident, however, that among the theologians of the second century none fought Gnosticism with such acuteness as did Irenaeus, who with unyielding consistency carried through the time

54. J.Reumann, 'OIKONOMIA-Terms in Paul in comparison with Lucan Heilsgeschichte', in NTS 13(1967), pp.147-67, quotation from p.147.

55. O.Cullmann, Christ and Time. The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History. 3rd Ed., ET, London, 1962.

line of redemptive history from the Creation to the eschatological new creation. Down to the theologians of the 'redemptive history' school in the nineteenth century there has scarcely been another theologian who has recognized so clearly as did Irenaeus that the Christian proclamation stands or falls with the redemptive history, that the historical work of Jesus Christ as Redeemer forms the mid-point of a line which leads from the Old Testament to the return of Christ. Therefore also no theologian of antiquity grasped so clearly as did Irenaeus the radical opposition which emerges between Greek and Biblical thinking as to this point, namely, the question of the conception of time. (56)

The truth of that statement, even within the narrow limits of the second century, will be amply borne out as we proceed. However, simply to use the term redemptive history (or salvation history) (57) would lead to a lack of

56. Cullmann, op.cit., pp.56f.

57. The German term Heilsgeschichte is not at all easy to translate into English. In the English translation of Christ and Time the term was rendered as 'redemptive history'. As the translator of Cullmann's Salvation in History (ET, London, 1967) observes in a Preface (p.17) 'redemptive history' is not really an accurate translation of Heilsgeschichte, and the term 'salvation history' was used instead. While even that term is not particularly graceful it has the merits of immediately recalling the German term, of being reasonably accurate, and of avoiding the misleading connotations of terms such as 'history of salvation' or 'saving history'. Throughout the present work the concept expressed by the German Heilsgeschichte has been indicated by the term 'salvation history'.

precision for there are two aspects to the role of Christ in the saving purposes of God in man's history as far as the theology of Irenaeus is concerned. On the one hand, there is the relationship of Christ to the events of history, from creation, through the history of the people of Israel, in the life, ministry and death of Jesus Christ and on into the history of the Church. On the other hand there is the idea of a divine plan carried out by or through Christ. These two things are not necessarily the same. In Irenaeus they are so closely interwoven as to be inseparable, as we shall see in a later section; for Irenaeus the divine plan is a plan that unfolds in history and is carried out by the Word of God; the divine plan is precisely God's activity in history for man's salvation, from the very moment of the Son's begetting to the final consummation of all things. Nevertheless, the notion of a divine plan need not imply God's action in history, nor need God's action in history imply a divine plan.

A divine plan can stand in one of several different relationships to history; it may have nothing to do with history at all, as is largely the case with Gnosticism; it may have a restricted relationship with one particular historical event, most notably the Incarnation; or it may have a relationship with the whole history of man from the creation to the final end, as in Irenaeus. Oscar Cullmann has suggested⁽⁵⁸⁾ that the most appropriate Greek word for

58. e.g. in Salvation in History, pp.75f.

what he understands by salvation history (Heilsgeschichte) and, even more specifically, for the plan of salvation is οἰκονομία. On that basis it might be expected that a study of the term οἰκονομία would form a major part of the present work. There is no doubt that the term can mean God's providential ordering of history, and we shall have occasion to examine the use of the word in various contexts as we proceed, but οἰκονομία does not refer primarily to history or temporal sequence at all, and it certainly does not do so in the New Testament period. The basic meaning of the word is 'management', 'administration', 'stewardship', with no reference to time at all.⁽⁵⁹⁾ The association with temporal sequence arises not from the word itself but from the context in which it is used. Cullmann appears to make the mistake of assuming an association of the idea of time sequence with οἰκονομία in the New Testament when he says that in I Cor. 9.17, Col. 1.25 and Eph. 3.2 there is a clear connection between Paul's

59. See, eg. Liddell and Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon, 9th ed. (Oxford, 1940), p. 1204. J.W. Bowman, in an article on the Dispensationalism of the Scofield Reference Bible, criticises Scofield for adding a temporal connotation to the term dispensation and the Greek word οἰκονομία on which the idea of Dispensationalism supposedly rests. Bowman comments: 'As any tyro in Greek is aware, the word translated "dispensation" in the Greek Bible (οἰκονομία) never means nor does it have any reference to a period of time as such.' (J.W. Bowman, 'The Bible and Modern Religions, II. Dispensationalism', in Interpretation 10(1956), pp. 170-87, quotation from p. 174).

conception of his office as steward and the revelation of the divine plan of salvation.⁽⁶⁰⁾ The connection depends on an assumed meaning of *οἰκονομία* that includes the idea of a planned salvation history. With regard to Pauline usage J.Reumann has maintained that "*οἰκονομία*" means "administration" more often than "plan of salvation" - if, indeed, it ever has that sense in the Pauline corpus. Heilsplan may be suggested by *μυστήριον* and other nearby words. But *οἰκονομία* more often than not denotes administration of purpose by God or by Paul.⁽⁶¹⁾

60. Cullmann, Salvation in History, p.76. Cf. the implications of the sub-title of Part 1 of his Christ and Time (p.35) 'The Continuous Redemptive line' -

οἰκονομία

61. Reumann's view that *οἰκονομία* probably does not mean 'plan of salvation' in Paul is not universally shared. O.Michel (in Kittel's TWNT, ET, vol.5, pp.151-53) and W.Tooley ('Stewards of God. An Examination of the terms *ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΟΣ* and *ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΑ* in the New Testament', in SoJTh 19(1966), pp. 74-86) both leave the question more open. Even if the meaning 'plan of salvation' is accepted, the idea that such a plan necessarily involves a time-line depends not on the meaning of *οἰκονομία* itself but on an awareness of the passage of time in the execution of the plan. Nothing that has been said in any way denies the significance and importance of Cullmann's studies in the New Testament and its conception of time and salvation history. What must be stated, however, is that *οἰκονομία* is not a technical term for salvation history.

Even in the Patristic period the primary meaning of *οἰκονομία* is still 'management' or 'administration', and although the word comes to have strong connections with divine providence this may not be immediately taken to include the idea of the divine ordering of historical events in sequence unless the context or other qualifying concepts express such an idea. Gullmann's contention⁽⁶²⁾ that Irenaeus uses *οἰκονομία* 'like later writers, in the sense of a salvation history' is somewhat misleading. G.L.Prestige observes that it is 'the Incarnation, for which the word "oekonomia", without any verbal qualification, is the regular patristic term from the third century onwards,⁽⁶³⁾ and an examination of G.W.H.Lampe's A Patristic Greek Lexicon⁽⁶⁴⁾ bears this out. So far as the divine *οἰκονομία* is concerned the meanings are: God's dispensation or ordering of the natural order and creation; God's special dispensations or interpositions especially of grace or mercy; the dispensation of grace in the sacraments; with special reference to the Incarnation as a dispensation of divine purpose, as virtually a synonym for *ἐνανθρώπησις*, with reference to the 'accommodation' or self-limitation of the Son, as a term referring to the person of the incarnate Word, as a term referring to the human nature of Christ, as a term for the works and acts of Christ, especially the passion, death and resurrection. While, then, the Incarnation when referred to as an *οἰκονομία* may include the idea

62. Salvation in History, p. 76.

63. G.L.Prestige, God in Patristic Thought (London, 1952), p. 67.

64. Oxford, 1961-68, pp.940-43.

of plan or purpose, it is clear that *οἰκονομία* is not in any way a technical term for a plan of salvation history.⁽⁶⁵⁾ Since there is no technical term that we can isolate that is used for God's plan of salvation, we have no choice but to disengage the idea of a plan from the writings of the second century wherever it occurs and however it is expressed.

65. It is a fine distinction but one that must be observed that, while *οἰκονομία* may indeed refer to God's providential activity in history, 'history' in that context is not to be understood without further ado as the divinely planned sequence of events. R.A. Markus, for example, in an article on the economy of the Trinity in Tertullian ('Trinitarian Theology and the Economy', in *JTS* ns. 9(1958), pp.89-102) draws on G.L. Prestige's distinction between the two primary theological uses of *οἰκονομία* in patristic literature and describes the former as 'that of "economy" as referring to the "covenanted dispensation of grace", to God's provisions for men as being unfolded in the course of history, subject to his providential plan for their salvation.' (p.90). Only the words 'covenanted dispensation of grace' come from Prestige. The implication that this is 'unfolded in the course of history' gives Prestige's interpretation a meaning it does not automatically have. A little later Markus maintains that at the time of Tertullian 'the "economy", though not, as yet, used absolutely without the qualifying genitive, as later, for instance, by Eusebius, already referred to the provisions made by God for the salvation of men within his gradually unfolding plan' (pp.91f.). Markus then refers to the antecedents of this use of *οἰκονομία* in Ephesians, Ignatius of Antioch, Athenagorus, Theophilus of Antioch, Justin Martyr and the use of the word as a key-concept by Irenaeus. The thesis advanced in the present study is that *οἰκονομία* did mean God's

Having considered the question of a divine plan in some detail, we must now go back and take up the other strand that makes up the whole concept of what Cullmann understands by salvation history. Not only may a divine plan stand in any one of a number of relationships to history, there are several different implications with regard to planning that may be drawn from a belief in God's activity in history. To speak of God's action in history implies that saving significance is to be found in historical events, but even here the exact nature of the relationship of this to the idea of an unfolding plan is not necessarily pre-determined. While the concept of some historical events being saving events takes seriously the activity of God in history, notably the events of Israel's history and the life and death of Christ, this activity need not always be seen as the progressive unfolding of a divine plan. The events of history may be interpreted as God's activity without history itself as an on-going process being raised to the level of a theological principle. To some extent the idea of a plan is inherent in the concept of salvation in history (to borrow the title of the English translation of Cullmann's work), that is, that God's activity is directed towards a

65. (contd.) providential acts of salvation in history, but not God's providential ordering of history for man's salvation. The latter meaning emerges with the development of the two strands of God's saving activity in history and God's plan of salvation in juxtaposition. (See below on Ignatius, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Justin and Irenaeus).

goal, but the extent to which the idea of a divine plan dominates in the thought of a theologian varies enormously from one theologian to another, and the implied plan itself can be quite restricted, e.g. to the Incarnation, or all-embracing, as in Irenaeus.

Cullmann uses the term Heilsgeschichte (salvation history) to cover both the aspects we have isolated here: God's plan of salvation and God's saving activity in history. Clearly we cannot use salvation history in the same sense in which it is used by Cullmann if we wish to retain the distinction we have made. At the same time, to use such a phrase as 'the activity of God in history' each time we wish to refer to the second strand would be cumbersome. We have therefore chosen to use the term salvation history to refer solely to that.⁽⁶⁶⁾ Consequently in what follows salvation history refers solely to the fact that some historical events are interpreted as saving events without any suggestion that the events form a planned sequence. On the other hand references to the divine plan refer solely to God's intentions without any implied reference to the working out of such a plan in history.

66. It is in this sense that Alan Richardson appears to understand the term Heilsgeschichte, e.g. in his History, Sacred and Profane (London, 1964; = the Bampton Lectures for 1962) when he says, 'It should be noted that there is another and quite unexceptionable sense of the expression Heilsgeschichte, namely, to refer to the acts of God for our salvation in the midst of the history of our world' (p.134, n.1). Richardson

In his earlier work, Christ and Time, Cullmann sees Heilsgeschichte as essentially a Christ-line,⁽⁶⁷⁾ so that, from the point of view of Christian theology to speak of Christocentric salvation history (as we do in the title of the present work and elsewhere) is to add nothing to the simple term salvation history. Since, however, there is such a thing as salvation history in Judaism (or at least a revelation history), and since later we wish to speak of a salvation drama in connection with Gnosticism (to say nothing of the fact that H.I.Marrou has discerned 'traces of the concept of salvation history in Valentinian Gnosticism'),⁽⁶⁸⁾ it seems advisable to add the extra precision.

Finally, to make it quite clear in what direction the present study is going, a point made above must be emphasised. In what follows we are concerned with the emergence of an idea into conscious and explicit expression in the writings of Irenaeus. In connection with the New Testament an important point is made by Cullmann:

66.(contd) attributes this understanding of the term to Cullmann, but this rather reduces the significance of the time-line that is so important for Cullmann.

67. Cf. part 1, ch. 7 'The Redemptive Line as Christ-Line.'

68. H.I.Marrou, 'La theologie de l'histoire dans la gnose valentinienne', in Le Origini dello Gnosticismo, ed. U.Bianchi (Leiden, 1967; = Numen Supplement 12), pp. 215 - 25.

It would be an error to believe that the entire redemptive history, understood in a Christian way, was at once revealed to the first Christians in the chronological sequence of its kairoi, as though they had learned it step by step - Nor is it the case that they learned to understand the entire process by beginning at the end and working back. Rather, the mid-point is also the starting point of Primitive Christian understanding; starting from that mid-point, the divine plan of salvation opened up in both a forward and backward direction.⁽⁶⁹⁾

Cullmann then sketches the 'Christ-line of redemptive history' and comments:

In the New Testament and other Primitive Christian writings the line just sketched is seldom presented in this systematic way and in its chronological sequence.⁽⁷⁰⁾

Even in the second century the extent to which both the divine plan and salvation history receive emphasis varies enormously and the most complete fusion of both strands and the fullest development of both is found in Irenaeus, and it is the emergence of that full and explicit theology that concerns us here.

What we shall now do is examine first the ecclesiastical tradition standing behind Irenaeus and the appearance there of the ideas of a divine plan and salvation history in relation to the person and work of Christ; secondly the Valentinian Gnostic tradition and the ideas of a divine plan and salvation drama in relation to the person and work of Christ; finally we shall examine the full development and fusion of both ideas and their relationship to Christology in Irenaeus.

69. Cullmann, Christ and Time, p. 107.

70. *ibid.*, p. 109.

PART TWO

THE ECCLESIASTICAL TRADITION

BEFORE IRENAEUS

INTRODUCTION

The central theme of the present section is the examination of the role of Christ in the divine plan of salvation and the role of Christ in salvation history. The factor which distinguishes this section from the following section on Gnosticism is that here we are in the main concerned with Christ's role in history and the divine plan as it is worked out in history, and Gnosticism has, again in the main, little or no concern for history. The material to be discussed here may be divided roughly into three groups; the Apostolic Fathers, the Apocryphal literature and the Apologists. By no means everything in these three groups is relevant to our task. While almost all the literature is important for a study of Christology, not all of it is susceptible of an approach to Christology from the point of view of salvation history and the divine plan of salvation, and it is those concepts that have determined the selection of material. The omission of some works from the discussion will cause no surprise therefore, but at the beginning of each of the following chapters a brief account of the works to be examined will be given, with, where necessary, justification for the exclusion of certain of them.

CHAPTER THREE

THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS

The dominant interest of the Apostolic Fathers⁽¹⁾ is ethical, and in some of the works the question of an approach to Christology from the standpoint of salvation history does not come into consideration. In II Clement there is no suggestion that Christ has any role either in a divine plan in history or in the saving acts of God in history apart from the Incarnation; history as such is entirely absent. In the Didache, reference is made to the relationship between Jesus and David: 'We give you thanks, our Father, for the holy vine of David your son ($\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\varsigma$), which You have made known to us through Jesus your Son ($\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\varsigma$) ' (9.2). The historical aspect of this phrase is not alluded to again, and certainly there is no historical frame in which the Christology might be set. In Polycarp's Letter to the Philippians, there is only one reference to an historical event (to the prophets proclaiming the coming of Christ - 6.3) other than the Incarnation and life of

1. The edition used (except for Hermas, on which see below n.103) is that of J.B.Lightfoot, The Apostolic Fathers, revised texts, edited and completed by J.R.Harmer (London, 1898). The translation used is from The Apostolic Fathers, A New Translation and Commentary, edited by R.M.Grant (6 vols. New York and Camden, N.J., 1964-68), though this has been departed from at several points, as indicated in the notes.

Christ, which provides insufficient evidence to form a theory of Christocentric salvation history in the sense given above. For similar reasons the Martyrdom of Polycarp is not discussed. These works, then, will be left aside from the discussion that follows.

I I CLEMENT

The Epistle written by the Church of Rome to the Church in Corinth was occasioned by a disciplinary problem in the Corinthian congregation.⁽²⁾ Clement, whose name is never mentioned but whose authorship of the epistle has never seriously been questioned, writes in the name of the Church at Rome, in order to restore peace in Corinth, which is disturbed by a sedition brought about by 'a few rash and self-willed individuals' (1.1). In the course of his argument, Clement makes frequent use of historical examples to illustrate for the Corinthians the blessings of faithfulness and obedience and the perils of disobedience.⁽³⁾ In general, these examples are cited simply as

2. The epistle was written about 95 or 96 AD. All the relevant introductory material is collected by Lightfoot in his The Apostolic Fathers. Part 1: S. Clement of Rome (2 vols. London, 1890); Cf. F.L.Cross, The Early Christian Fathers, (London, 1960), pp. 11 - 13.
3. See e.g. chapters 7 - 12, 17f., 31f., 45, 51, 53 and 55.

examples and not as signs of God's saving activity in history; this is above all clear in the fact that Clement goes outside of the Biblical account for his examples of the selflessness of some kings for the sake of their people (55.1). Even though he goes on to cite the intervention of God as a result of the willingness of Judith to expose herself to danger for the sake of her people, and the example of Esther (55.4-6), Clement's interest here is on the selflessness of the people concerned as an example to the trouble-makers in Corinth and not on the intervention of God in history.⁽⁴⁾ Nevertheless, there are signs of a genuine salvation history in I Clement.

4. Cf. 'History is, in fact, looked on as a collection of examples which awaken in men the realization of right and wrong, and thus lead to improvement through knowledge' (R.L.P. Milburn, Early Christian Interpretations of History, London, 1954; = The Bampton Lectures of 1952, p. 29). Later, Milburn goes on to say: 'there is here no toying with ideas of history as perpetual recurrence or as governed by blind necessity. Rather it is a straight, or perhaps spiral, line running from the origin of things to their consummation and, according to "Clement", God guides his people, throughout history, by chastisement as also with mercy.' (ibid., pp. 30f.). This is true, as we shall see, except insofar as Clement is not interested in, and not profoundly aware of, the 'line' of history as such.

A genuine salvation history appears immediately after Clement has pointed out to the Corinthians that their very excellence had brought about their downfall, and the trouble-makers had become jealous of their honoured leaders. (Ch.3). Having given further examples of the persecution of the righteous out of jealousy and envy, he exhorts his readers to repentance (7.4). Clement continues: 'Let us survey all the generations and learn that in generation after generation the Master gave an opportunity for repentance to those who are willing to turn to Him' (7.5). The repentance made available to all in Christ has been shown beforehand by God in the history of Israel, and in the succeeding chapters Clement cites many examples of repentance and humility from the Old Testament, and on the account of Lot's rescue from Sodom he comments, 'the Master made it clear that he does not abandon those who set their hope on Him, but delivers punishment and torment to those who turn away from him' (11.1). Not only is repentance foreshown in the history of Israel, but Christ himself has an active role in the Old Testament: 'Now Christian faith confirms all this; for Christ himself summons us thus through the Holy Spirit: "Come, children, listen to me, I will teach you the fear of the Lord . . .'" (Ps.33.12)' (22.1). In other words, in the Psalm Christ addresses men through the Holy Spirit. This passage should not be pressed too hard; Clement may not have had in mind the explicit idea that Christ was active in the inspiration of the Psalm, but rather have been thinking of

the aptness of the Psalm inspired by the Holy Spirit to express the call of Christ to men. Similarly, the first person singular of Ps. 22 (I Cl. 16.15f.) leads Clement to see here Christ speaking in the words of the Psalm. Again, perhaps, it is the wording of the Psalm rather than any theological conviction about the activity of Christ in the Old Testament that prompts Clement's introductory phrase. Nevertheless, he does not regard such a statement as inappropriate.⁽⁵⁾ Apart from these two cases Christ does not have any specific role in salvation history prior to the Incarnation.

Christ has no part to play in creation.⁽⁶⁾ Clement mentions the creation because it furnishes an example that God himself does not cease from doing good (33.1), 'for the creator and master (*δημιουργὸς καὶ δεσπότης*) of

5. Cf. Lightfoot, I Clement vol. 2, ad loc.

6. With the exception of one possible reference in the closing liturgical passages: 'To hope in thy Name as in the source of all creation (*ἐλπίζειν ἐπὶ τὸ ἀρχέγονον πάσης κτίσεως ὀνομά σου*)' (I Cl. 59.3). Here Daniélou identifies the Name as the *λόγος* who was *ἐν ἀρχῇ*, but the whole section is a catena of OT references (J. Daniélou, The Development of Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea. I: The Theology of Jewish Christianity, ET, London, 1964, p.151). Cf. Lightfoot, I Clement, ad loc. On the lack of any role given to Christ in creation see J. Lebreton, Histoire du dogme de la Trinité des origines au concile de Nicée Vol. II De S. Clément à S. Irénée (Paris, 1928) pp. 265ff.

all things himself rejoices in his works' (33.2). Clement gives a brief account of creation and comes to the creation of man: 'And finally, with His holy and faultless hands He fashioned man, the pre-eminent and greatest work of his intelligence,⁽⁷⁾ the very impress of his own image (εἰκόν)' (33.4). There is no hint here of the identification of the hands of God as the Son and the Spirit as in Irenaeus⁽⁸⁾ or as Word and Wisdom as in Theophilus of Antioch. Clement also exhorts his readers (chh. 19f.) to consider the gifts of peace as exemplified in God's providence in the world, and here too Christ has no part to play.

Although, therefore, Christ plays little or no part in salvation history prior to the Incarnation, He is the centre of this salvation history for it points towards him; the examples of repentance lead up to the repentance offered to all in Christ (I Cl. 7.4); there is also an explicit connection made between Jacob and Jesus. Clement refers to the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as examples of the way in which God has conferred his blessings

7. The version in Grant's edition does not translate the phrase *κατὰ διάνοιαν*, but the notes refer this to man; i.e., man is the greatest work of God on account of his intelligence. Lightfoot (I Clement, ed loc.) finds this sentiment out of place on the lips of Clement, particularly in view of the strong *παρμύγετες*, and prefers to see here a reference to God's creative intelligence.

8. Cf. J. Lebreton, op. cit., pp. 258f.

(ch.31) and of Jacob he says, 'for from Jacob came all the priests and Levites who serve at the altar of God; from him is descended the Lord Jesus according to the flesh. From him came the kings and rulers and governors in the Judaeen succession. Nor do his other sceptres lack lustre, for God promised, "Your seed shall be as the stars of heaven". ' The point of referring to these examples is that they show that 'to all of them came honour and greatness not through themselves nor their deeds nor yet through the righteous action they took, but through his will.' Clement continues: 'so we too, who by his will have been called in Christ Jesus, are justified not of ourselves but through that faith, through which almighty God has justified all men from the beginning' (32.2-4). In this section there is clear expression of the idea of God's continuing activity in the affairs of men, but, at the same time, the idea that all of the Old Testament period was simply a preparation for Christ and that Christ completely surpasses his fore-runners is not conveyed with any forcefulness; the patriarchs and Christ both illustrate that men are saved by the will of God and not by their own endeavours. The progression of history as the unfolding of a divine plan receives little emphasis in spite of Clement's understanding of the reality of God's continuing saving activity.

This does not mean that Christ is seen by Clement as being on the same level as the patriarchs of the Old Testament; Clement is fully aware of the divine status

of Jesus Christ and of the redemption that he brings to all men. This is borne out by the phrase about Jacob: 'From him is descended the Lord Jesus according to the flesh' (32.2). This in itself suggests that 'according to the spirit' he is of divine origin; furthermore, the priests are from Jacob, but Jesus is the High Priest.⁽⁹⁾ Jesus is also 'Lord'. This divine origin is made much more explicit in the following: 'For it is to the humble that Christ belongs, not to those who exalt themselves over his flock. The sceptre of the majesty of God, the Lord Jesus Christ, did not come with the pomp of pride or arrogance, though he could have, but in humility' (16.1f.) Here, the glory of Christ is clearly expressed in the description of him as 'the sceptre of the majesty of God'. Statements such as the two above make it clear that there is no question of an adoptionist Christology in Clement; he is, by implication, of divine origin according to the Spirit and could have come 'with the pomp of pride or arrogance'.⁽¹⁰⁾ The passage at the end of the epistle, 'Finally may the all-seeing God, the Master of spirits and Lord of all flesh, who chose the Lord Jesus Christ and us through him to be his own people . . .' (64.1) cannot refer to an adoptionist Christology in the strict sense of the word, but to the fact that Jesus Christ was the means

9. I Cl. 36.1; 61.3; 64.

10. This attests a pneumatic Christology in I Clement according to Harnack (History of Dogma, vol.1, p. 192 n. 1).

through which God brought about the redemption of man and the gathering of the people of God.⁽¹¹⁾ The statement is not about the nature of Christ but his work.⁽¹²⁾ The divine origin of Christ is again linked with his mission in another passage: 'The apostles received the gospel for us from Jesus Christ, and Jesus the Christ was sent from God. So Christ is from God, and the apostles are from Christ; thus both came in proper order by the will of God.'⁽¹³⁾

It is above all in his work that Christ appears as the centre of salvation history. The repentance foreshadowed in the Old Testament becomes extended to all men in the coming of Christ. Hence Clement exhorts his readers: 'Let us fix our gaze on the blood of Christ and realize how precious it is to his Father, for it was poured out for our salvation and brought the grace of repentance to the whole world' (7.4). The pouring out of Jesus' blood was the means by which redemption was achieved.⁽¹⁴⁾ How the death of Jesus brought about

11. In other words 'chosen' reflects not the adoption of Christ but his being chosen for a purpose. Cf. J. Lawson, A Theological and Historical Introduction to the Apostolic Fathers (New York, 1961), p. 58, on I Cl. 59.2, 'the number of the elect'.

12. Cf. I Cl. 32.4. As Lebreton points out (op.cit., p. 274) the interest of Clement is in the divine action of salvation, not in the mystery of the divine life in itself.

13. I Cl. 42.1f. Cf. Grant, Apostolic Fathers, I & II Clement, ad loc. Cf. also I Cl. 36.1ff.

14. Cf. I Cl. 21.6.

redemption Clement does not explain, but it is bound up with the love of God for man. 'In love our Master received us; because of the love he had for us our Lord Jesus Christ by the will of God shed his blood for us, gave his flesh for our flesh and his life for our lives' (49.6). The scope of the benefits brought by Christ is well expressed in chapter 36 of the epistle: 'This is the way, beloved, in which we found our salvation, Jesus Christ, the high priest of our offerings, the protector and helper of our weakness. Through him we fix our eyes on the heights of heaven; through him we see mirrored the flawless and sublime countenance of God; through him the eyes of our heart have been opened; through him our foolish and darkened understanding springs up to the light; through him the Master has willed that we should taste immortal knowledge.' Redemption consists not only in repentance but in knowledge and insight. Redemption centres on Christ because of what he does for man, and this redemption depends on who Christ is: 'For "since he is the express image of his greatness, he is as much superior to angels as his title is superior" to theirs (cf. Heb. 1.3f.)' (36.2). Clement goes on to cite further verses of Hebrews to support this statement. (15)

Whatever value the Old Testament may have had, repentance, knowledge and insight all depend on Christ. He is also the focal point of the divine salvation in that through Christ the people of God are gathered together.

15. I Cl. 36.3. Heb. 1.7 = Ps.103.4; Heb.1.5 = Ps.2.7f.; Heb.1.13 = Ps.109.1.

The connection between knowledge of God and the gathering of the elect is quite explicit: 'We shall beg with earnest prayer and supplication that the Creator of all things will keep intact the precise number of his elect in all the world through his beloved Servant ($\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\varsigma$) Jesus Christ, through whom he has called us from darkness into light, from ignorance into the knowledge of the glory of his Name; Thou dost multiply the nations upon the earth and from them all thou hast chosen those who love thee through Jesus Christ thy beloved Servant ($\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\varsigma$), through whom thou dost discipline, sanctify and honour us' (59.2f.).

The gathering of the faithful is emphasised by describing the Church in terms of the body of Christ, and the disturbances in Corinth are likened to rending the body.⁽¹⁶⁾ Closely allied to the Church as the body of Christ and the disturbances as the rending of the body is the thought in Clement's mind of the Christian's activity as an imitation of Christ: 'You see, beloved brethren, what an example has been given us! For if the Lord himself was so humble, what should we do who have come under the yoke of his grace?' (16.17). The whole attitude is well summed-up in this: 'Let him who in Christ has love keep the commandments of Christ' (49.1).

There is no doubt, then, that for Clement Christ holds the central position in the saving activity of God. There is also in Clement's mind a connection between the activity of God in the Old Testament and the work of Christ.

16. I Cl. 38.1; 46.5.

The coming of Christ is prepared for in the Old Testament, and Christ is the fulfilment of the promises of God to Jacob. More should not be read into this, however, than the evidence will bear. That Clement sees God's saving acts in history centred on Christ does not mean that he therefore sees history itself as the gradual unfolding of the divine plan culminating in the redemption of man by the death of Christ on the cross. The lines of comparison between past and the present in Christ are not rigorously drawn and pursued in detail. History in itself does not interest Clement at all. The events which happen in history are not seen as divinely ordered stages in the working out of salvation history. In addition to this, apart from his central role in the Incarnation, Christ plays a very minor part in the history that precedes that event. There is, then, a genuine salvation history in I Clement, and it is undoubtedly Christocentric, but, by comparison with what we shall see in Irenaeus, it is no more than a preliminary sketch, and of the idea of a divine plan in history we have seen no trace. All this can be briefly verified again with reference to the history from the time of the Incarnation until the consummation. The kingdom of Christ is expected to come (I Cl.50.3), and to come suddenly (23.5), but neither the Church nor man in general is seen as progressing towards this goal. Nevertheless, the future resurrection is Christocentric in that it is dependent on the resurrection of Christ as the first-fruits (I Cl. 24.1).

II IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH

There is a much fuller awareness of the movement of history as salvation history in Ignatius⁽¹⁷⁾ than in I Clement. The easiest point at which to see this is in relation to the idea of revelation in the Old Testament as a preparation for Christ. Nowhere is this more clearly expressed than in the letter to the Philadelphians, when Ignatius compares Judaism and Christianity: 'The priests are noble, but the High-priest entrusted with the Holy of Holies is nobler; he alone has been entrusted with the secrets of God; he himself is the door to the Father, through which enter Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, and the prophets and apostles and the Church. All these are in the unity of God. But the gospel has something distinctive: the coming of the Saviour, our Lord Jesus Christ, his passion and resurrection. For the beloved prophets made a proclamation related to him; but the gospel is the perfection of imperishability.'⁽¹⁸⁾ In spite of his

17. The details of the circumstances in which Ignatius of Antioch wrote his seven epistles on his journey to martyrdom in Rome in the early years of the second century are given by Lightfoot in his The Apostolic Fathers. Part 2: S. Ignatius. S. Polycarp (3 vols., London, 1885) and by Virginia Corwin in her St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch (New Haven, 1960; = Yale Publications in Religion 1), part one; cf. F. L. Cross, The Early Christian Fathers, pp. 15-18.

18. Phld. 9.1f. Cf. 'The Old Testament priests are good, that is, they have a part to play in the plan of salvation; but the High Priest (Jesus, as in Hebrews and I Clement 36.1, etc.) is greater, since he has been

spirited rejection of Judaistic tendencies (Phld. 6), Ignatius holds strongly to the link between the Old Testament and the New. Not only did the prophets proclaim the coming of Christ but they and the patriarchs enter through Christ to the Father along with the Church. (19) Nevertheless, there is a clear distinction made between the Old and the New; as the passage itself expresses it, 'the gospel has something distinctive', and 'the beloved prophets made a proclamation related to Christ; but the gospel is the perfection of imperishability.' (20) Nothing is said in this

(contd.)

18. entrusted with the Holy of Holies (Heb.9.3) and God's secrets.' (Grant, The Apostolic Fathers, Ignatius, pp.106f.).
19. Cf. Smyrn. 5.1.
20. Of the phrase ἀπάρτισμα ἀφθαρσίας Lightfoot says: "the completed work of immortality", as the law was the first stage.' (S. Ignatius, ad loc.).
21. The statement of Corwin that Ignatius 'holds stubbornly to the idea that at least some historical events are to be taken seriously as the work of God,' (op.cit., p.101) is directed at least in part against those who regard Ignatius as strongly gnostic and consequently without any interest in salvation history. The gnostic quality of Ignatius's thought was stressed by H. Schlier (Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den Ignatiusbriefen, Giessen, 1929; = Beiheft ZNTW 8) and H.W. Bartsch (Gnostisches Gut und Gemeindetradition bei Ignatius von Antiochien, Gütersloh, 1940; = Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, Reihe 2, Band. 44). The so-called gnostic elements are often open to another interpretation, as Corwin herself has shown (Cf. also the light shed on the Jewish-Christian elements of some of Ignatius's ideas by Daniélou), and Ignatius certainly lays heavy emphasis on historicity. This, however, is

passage about the acts of God in the history of Israel, but nevertheless, the contrast between prophecy and fulfilment suggests that history is moving in one particular direction.⁽²¹⁾ The same points can be observed in another passage in the same epistle: 'The prophets we also love because they made a proclamation related to the gospel and set their hope on him and were waiting for him' (Phld. 5.2). The prophets also share in the saving activity of Christ, as the passage goes on to state, but to that point we shall shortly return. The Christocentricity of the work of the prophets is further emphasised by the fact that Ignatius describes them as disciples of Christ: 'Of whom, even the prophets were disciples in the Spirit, him whom they expected as their teacher. And therefore when he came, he whom they rightly awaited⁽²²⁾ raised them from the dead.'⁽²³⁾ Again, the connection between prophecy of and salvation by Christ is to be noted.⁽²⁴⁾ As far as

21.(contd.) not the same thing as salvation history, and of the continuity of history Ignatius is not strongly aware, even though he is aware of some movement in one direction.

22. δικαίως; not 'righteously' (Grant), but 'rightly'. See Lightfoot, Ignatius, ad.loc.

23. Magn. 9.3. Cf. Magn. 8.2. The idea that the prophets are disciples of Christ is Jewish-Christian in origin. See Grant, Apostolic Fathers, Ignatius, on Magn. 9.3. and Daniélou, op.cit., pp.41, 102ff.

24. A point to which we shall return. See below, p.103

salvation history is concerned, it is also to be noted that the Christocentricity consists in the expectation of Christ and not in any role that Christ has directly in the work of the prophets.⁽²⁵⁾

Beyond the movement from prophecy to fulfilment there is also evidence in Ignatius of God's continuing arrangement of things before they happen. This can be seen with regard to the coming of Christ and his redemptive work.

'For Jesus Christ our inseparable life, is the expressed purpose (γνώμη)⁽²⁶⁾ of the Father' (Eph. 3.2). Even more specific is the following: 'For our God, Jesus the Christ, was conceived by Mary in accordance with the plan of God (οἰκονομία) - of the seed of David and of the Holy Spirit' (Eph. 18.2). οἰκονομία here relates specifically to the Incarnation.⁽²⁷⁾ This plan includes the manifestation of

25. Cf. 'What was important was not primarily that to them (sc. the prophets) was entrusted revelation of his (sc. Christ's) life but that their lives were oriented to, and received meaning from this crucial event still in the future' (Corwin, op.cit., p.99). Later Corwin asks whether it is not to overstate the case to suggest that 'Ignatius' emphasis on the true humanity' implies 'a particularly vivid sense of the reality of history' (ibid., p.101). Again, it should be said that Ignatius is more interested in historicity than in history as an on-going process.

26. 'This term here takes the place of the more usual λόγος or σοφία, as describing the relation of Christ to the Father.' (Lightfoot, S. Ignatius, ad loc.). Cf. also M. Rackl, Die Christologie des hl. Ignatius von Antiochien (Freiburg i.B., 1914), pp. 277-80.

27. See the note of Lightfoot, S. Ignatius, ad loc.

the new man, Jesus Christ (Eph. 20.1), and the redemption that he brings, which is the dissolution of magic, the abolition of ignorance and the destruction of the old kingdom, 'since God was becoming manifest in human form for the newness of eternal life; what had been prepared by God ($\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\iota}\xi\epsilon\iota\nu$) had its beginning' (Eph. 19.3). The idea of the working out of God's divine purposes includes the establishment of the Church. Ignatius writes to the Ephesians: 'Ignatius, also called Theophorus, to the church constituted at Ephesus in Asia - blessed in greatness by the fullness of God the Father, foreordained before the ages ($\pi\rho\omega\rho\iota\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\ \pi\rho\delta\ \alpha\acute{\iota}\omega\nu\omega\nu$) to be in lasting and unchanging glory forever, united and elect in a genuine suffering passion (by the will of the Father and Jesus Christ our God).'⁽²⁸⁾ Even the life of Ignatius himself is directed and ordered by the divine will (Rom. 1.1f.).

From what we have seen up to this point, there is evidence in Ignatius of Antioch both of the idea of salvation history and of a divine plan. The relationship between these and the unfolding of history is not worked out in detail and both are Christocentric in that they point to and take their significance from the Incarnation and not from any idea that Christ has been the agent of God in every stage of the manifestation of the plan in history. We now go on to consider some of the aspects of Ignatius's Christology in the light of this.

28. Eph. pf. Cf. 'to the church beloved and enlightened by the will of him who willed all things that exist' (Rom. pf.) and 'at the beginning and at the end' (Magn. 13.1).

We have already seen that Ignatius is aware of the movement from the Old Testament to the New. He is also aware of a movement of Christ in relation to the Father.⁽²⁹⁾

'All of you must run together as to one temple of God; as to one sanctuary, to one Jesus Christ, who proceeded (προελθόντα) from one Father and is with the one and departed to the One' (Magn. 7.2). This movement is not a movement of Christ away from the Father and back to him in the sense that he was ever separated from the Father; nor does it refer to the begetting of the Son; it is, rather, the movement of revelation in the mission of the Son, for Christ is the revelation of the Father.⁽³⁰⁾ Ignatius

explains that the prophets were persecuted because they were inspired by God's grace in order 'to convince the disobedient that there is one God who manifested himself through Jesus Christ his Son, who is his Word which proceeded from silence (ὅς ἐστιν αὐτοῦ λόγος ἀπὸ σιγῆς προελθών) and in every respect pleased him who sent him.'⁽³¹⁾

The movement begins with the sending of the Son; it is a movement from silence to speech, the speech of God's self-disclosure. There is here no interest in the begetting of the Son by the Father nor in the philosophical possibilities of the word Logos, the interest is solely in

29. As Corwin points out (*op.cit.* pp. 116ff.), Ignatius very seldom refers to the Father alone. 'It is as the ground of Jesus Christ, who manifested and expressed him, that the Father most frequently appears Jesus Christ has become the means by which the action of the Father is effected.' (*ibid.*, p.117)

30. See Lightfoot, S.Ignatius, ad loc., and Corwin, *op.cit.*,

the movement from silence to revelation.⁽³²⁾ This is borne out by another passage: 'Jesus Christ will make plain to

30. (contd.) pp. 134ff.

31. Magn. 8.2. On the text, see Lightfoot, S. Ignatius, ad loc.

32. The exact meaning of the phrase is difficult to determine. On the one hand, Lightfoot, rejecting the idea that the procession from silence refers to the divine generation of the Word (a point agreed by all modern studies), maintains that it 'might be used at any point where there is a sudden transition from non-manifestation to manifestation' (S. Ignatius, ad loc.), and that it refers to 'the period before the Incarnation' (ibid.). Corwin rightly rejects this as too simple; the concept of silence in Ignatius is more complex than that. The idea of silence is bound up with the idea of the mysteries of God and the hiddenness of God. Also when Ignatius says of the incarnate Christ that 'what he has done in silence ($\sigma\iota\gamma\acute{\alpha}\nu$) is worthy of the Father. He who has truly acquired the word of Jesus can also hear his silence ($\eta\sigma\upsilon\chi\acute{\iota}\alpha$), so that he may become perfect and act through what he says and be known through what he does not say ($\delta\iota' \acute{\epsilon}\nu \sigma\iota\gamma\acute{\alpha}$)' (Eph. 15. 1f.), he is not talking of 'the passive side of our Lord's life' (as Lightfoot maintains, S. Ignatius, ad loc.). Corwin sees in this an indication of 'the very core of his being' (op. cit., p. 122). Likewise the silence of bishops 'seems to be connected with his conviction that in silence the real person resides' (ibid., p. 123). All this is true and sheds a lot of light on the use of the concept of silence in Ignatius, but when Miss Corwin goes on to equate 'the real person' with the silence in which it resides, and, quite logically therefore, to equate the silence of God with the $\sigma\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ of God (ibid., p. 123) so that 'God is "Silence"' (ibid., p. 118) she goes beyond the evidence.

you that I speak the truth, and he is the mouth that cannot lie (τὸ ἀψευδὲς στόμα), by which the Father truly spoke.' (33) Also Ignatius sees that he himself will be a word (λόγος) of God if the Romans do not prevent his martyrdom (Rom. 2.1).

32.(Contd.) The contrast in Ephesians 15.2 is a straightforward one; words can be hypocritical, deeds cannot (a point that Corwin herself acknowledges, p. 105). The fact that the real person can be encountered in silence does not mean that the real person is silence. M.Rackl (op. cit., pp. 270-77) considers it possible that 'silence' here refers not to the silence of God, but to the silence of the universe with particular reference to the silence at Christ's birth. Also, with regard to λόγος, Rackl considers that Christ is the revelation of God because he is his Word, and not vice versa. Cf. also Lebreton, op. cit., pp. 320-26. H.Schlier (op. cit., pp. 34-39) sees in the λόγος here the redeemer-figure through whom God reveals himself to the world, the closest parallels to which are to be found in pre-Valentinian Gnosis. The 'proof' of this is the hypostasised figure of Sige in the Valentinian system. Cf. Bartsch (op. cit., pp. 53-71) who sees in this passage an emphasis not on the revelation through the Logos, but on the manifestation of 'Silence', which is associated with the mystical vision of God. In this manifestation the Logos has the role of the Revealer, but it is a subsidiary role as the cult-god and of secondary importance to the Silence itself which is God. Bartsch finds the closest parallels to this in Gnostic material. There is no doubt that Silence figures prominently in Valentinian Gnosticism (see below pp. 353ff.) but it is by no means clear that direct influence of this on Ignatius can be substantiated. See Barnard, Studies in the Apostolic Fathers, pp. 19-30, who argues that 'Gnosticism was at the most a peripheral influence

It is to be noted also that the movement is related directly to the Incarnation; the pre-existence of Christ is affirmed but there is no direct link between the procession of Christ from the Father and the Old Testament, at least not in the sense that Christ has any part in the proclamation of his own coming. The Old Testament prepared for the coming of Christ, but Ignatius's real interest is fixed on the manifestation of God in the incarnate Lord.⁽³⁴⁾

The union between the Father and Christ in the divine self-revelation is emphasised by Ignatius on account of the example it gives of the union that ought to exist in the Church between the bishop and the people,⁽³⁵⁾ but this does not mean that Ignatius confuses Christ with the Father, it is simply a question of what he is emphasising.⁽³⁶⁾ There

32.(Contd.) on the content of his thought' (p. 27). Cf. Corwin, op. cit., pp. 123 - 183 f.

On the Logos as spoken word, i.e. as revealer, not as innate reason, see Corwin op. cit., pp. 125-27. On the whole Logos-Sige question, *ibid.*, pp. 118-30. Cf. T.E.Pollard, Johannine Christology and the Early Church (Cambridge, 1970; = Soc. NTS Monographs 13), pp. 27-31.

33. Rom. 8.2. Cf. Odes of Sol. 12.11; Gospel of Truth 26.34.

34. Cf. Lebreton, op. cit., pp. 323 f. who sees in Ignatius a succession of manifestations leading up to the Incarnation, and compares this with Irenaeus; but as we have seen, the idea of Christ's work in the Old Testament is not important for Ignatius, and the progression towards the Incarnation is not of theological significance.

35. Eph. 5.1; Magn. 7.1; 13.2; Phld. 7.2; Smyrn. 8.1. See Corwin, op. cit., pp. 193ff, Lebreton, op. cit., pp. 289-95.

is in fact some distinction discernible in the work done, though that is to be expected since when it comes to the divine activity, Ignatius thinks first and foremost of the work of the incarnate Christ.⁽³⁷⁾ No passage more clearly illustrates what we have been saying than the following:

'(the deacons) entrusted with the service of Jesus Christ - who before the ages was with the Father and was made manifest at the end' (Magn. 6.1). Ignatius is well aware

36. Cf. 'Revelation is possible because Son and Father are united' (Corwin, *op. cit.*, p. 134). On the union of Father and Son and the revelation of the Father, see *ibid.*, pp. 134 - 37. As Lebreton points out (*op. cit.*, pp. 282 - 89) the union of Father and Son is thought of by Ignatius primarily as a union in the work of salvation, and not in relation to the inner-trinitarian life,

37. In Ignatius's maintaining of the tension between the unity of the Son with the Father and the distinction of the Son from the Father Pollard sees the Johannine paradox of the Father-Son relationship preserved. Ignatius represents no advance on the witness of St. John at this point, nor on the understanding of the relationship of the divine to the human in Jesus Christ, (Pollard, *op. cit.*, pp. 26 - 33, esp. p. 33). Cf. M. Rackl, *op. cit.*, pp. 87 - 289, C.C. Richardson, The Christianity of Ignatius of Antioch (New York, 1935), pp. 40 - 45 and Lebreton, *op. cit.*, 282 - 89, 295 - 319.

38. Eph. 3.2; 18.2.

of the passage of time and of the appearance of Christ at the crucial point in history, and to that extent we may correctly speak of Christocentric salvation history, but the thought of Ignatius passes directly from the divine origin of Christ to the Incarnation. Let us then consider the Incarnation in a little more detail.

The incarnate Lord is without doubt the centre of Ignatius's theology. We are not concerned to give here a full discussion of his understanding of the incarnate Christ, but only of his Christology as it relates to the question of salvation history. We have already seen that Ignatius sees the Incarnation as taking place according to a pre-arranged plan.⁽³⁸⁾ Ignatius also lays considerable emphasis on the historicity of the life of Jesus. He exhorts the Magnesians to be 'fully convinced about the birth and the passion and the resurrection which took place in the time of the rule of Pontius Pilate; for these things were truly and surely done by Jesus Christ, our hope' (Magn. 11). They blaspheme the Lord who do not confess that 'He is clothed in flesh (σάρκοφόρος)' (Smyrn. 5. 2). Here at once we see that the real emphasis of Ignatius on the historical is his attack on docetism,⁽³⁹⁾ as emerges with particular clarity in the epistle to the Trallians: 'Be deaf then, when anyone speaks to you apart from Jesus Christ, who was of the family of David, who was of Mary, who was truly born, ate and drank, was truly

39. For Ignatius's attack on docetism see Corwin, op. cit., pp. 94 - 98. Cf. also M. Rackl, op. cit., pp. 89 - 127.

persecuted under Pontius Pilate, was truly crucified and died while heavenly, earthly and subterranean beings looked on. . . But if his suffering was only apparent . . . , why am I in bonds?' (40) In fact, then, the stress laid on the historical reality of the birth, passion, death and resurrection (41) does not imply that Ignatius sees them in this context as taking place at the crucial point in history, though elsewhere he asserts that the Incarnation took place at the end of time (Magn. 6.1), nor does it imply that the Incarnation is the crucial stage in the unfolding of the salvation history. The Incarnation is a decisive historical event, but not, in Ignatius' thought, a crowning event among other events in history.

In spite of what has just been said, there is a connection between the Incarnation and man's past history and also the Church. Towards the end of his letter to the Ephesians, Ignatius promises them that 'If Jesus Christ deems me worthy through your prayer, and if it is God's will, in the second brochure which I am going to write you

40. Trall. 9f. Both Smyrnaeans and Trallians were clearly written against docetists, just as Magnesians and Philadelphians attack Judaisers in the main. On the factions, and the question of whether it was one faction or two, see Corwin, op. cit., pp. 52 - 87. Cf. C.C.Richardson, op. cit., pp. 51 - 54, 77 - 85 and L.W.Barnard, Studies in the Apostolic Fathers, pp. 19 - 30.

41. Corwin gives an exhaustive list of the references to the historical events associated with the Incarnate Lord. Ibid., pp. 94f.

I will give you the explanation of what I have begun - the divine plan (οἰκονομία) in relation to the new man Jesus Christ, . . . '(42) What Ignatius had begun to speak about in the preceding paragraph is probably to be regarded therefore as a summary statement of what he intended to say in the promised tract. In the preceding paragraph he deals with the effects of the Incarnation and says: 'Thus all magic was dissolved and every bond of wickedness vanished, ignorance was abolished and the old kingdom was destroyed, since God was becoming manifest in human form (ἀνθρωπίνως) for the newness of eternal life; what had been prepared by God had its beginning' (Eph. 19.3). The reference to the new man in the first passage and to the appearance of God in human form for eternal life in the second passage taken together indicate that in the Incarnation God appeared in the likeness of man in order to renew man for eternal life. With this we may compare the description of Christ as perfect man, who strengthens Ignatius in the suffering that he is to endure (Smyrn. 4.2). There is, then, a fleeting glimpse, but no more than a glimpse, of

42. Eph. 20.1. To suggest (as do Markus, art. cit., JTS n.s. 9(1958), p. 92, and Cullmann, Salvation in History, p. 76 (by implication) that οἰκονομία here refers to a gradually unfolding divine plan is to give to the word a significance it does not of itself possess. See above, chapter 2, pp. 54 - 64
43. Lightfoot sees in the κινὸς ἄνθρωπος of Ignatius the ἑσχατος Ἀδάμ and δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος of Paul (I Cor. 15.45, 47) (S. Ignatius, p. 85). The question of the

(43)
the idea of Christ as a second Adam. There is no suggestion here of man's history or development as we shall see it in Irenaeus, nor is there any suggestion that Christ has had any role to play in man's existence prior to the Incarnation, nevertheless there is here a point at which Christ is the centre of the discontinuity between the old man and the new man in Christ.

The association of the Incarnation with the Church is not unrelated to what we have just said. In the epistle to the Ephesians Ignatius says: 'The Lord received ointment on His head for this reason - that He might breathe imperishability upon the Church' (Eph. 17.1). The exact connection between 'receiving ointment' and 'breathing imperishability' is not clear⁽⁴⁴⁾ but the reference to imperishability recalls

43.(contd.) provenance of Ignatius's terms 'New Man' and 'Perfect Man' does not strictly come into consideration here, for the important point is how he used the idea. Schlier (op. cit., pp. 172 - 74) sees in the term 'New Man' clear evidence of gnostic traits in Ignatius. Corwin (op. cit., pp. 111 - 13) is much more cautious. The evidence is far from conclusive one way or the other.

44. In this present study nothing can be done beyond hinting at some possible lines of interpretation. The difficulty lies in the somewhat awkward transition from Christ to the Church with the accompanying change of concept from ointment to imperishability. However, from the context three things can be said with reasonable confidence:

- (a) The link between the anointing and the imperishability lies in the smell, for the next phrase reads: 'Do not be anointed with the bad smell ($\deltaυσωδία$) of the teaching of the ruler of this age.'
- (b) The anointing of Christ on the head is the type of

the reference above to Christ as 'God becoming manifest in human form for the newness of eternal life' (Eph. 19.3).

There is then, a clear connection between Christ and imperishability in the Church, but again this historical connection is not developed, though the hint of the continuing salvation history is there.

44.(contd.) and the justification for the anointing with imperishability which the Christian is expected to receive in contrast to the anointing with the bad smell of false teaching.

(c) Since the anointing with a bad smell is clearly metaphorical, it is unlikely that any Christian rite lies behind the receiving of imperishability.

The association with the smell suggests a probable connection with the Biblical accounts of the anointing of Jesus, especially the account in John (12.3; cf. Mt. 26.7; Mk 14.3), so that the present passage has the meaning: Christ receives the ointment and 'sheds the fragrance of incorruptibility on the Church' (Lightfoot, Ignatius, ad loc.; cf. Grant, Apostolic Fathers, Ignatius, ad loc.). Other possible lines of investigation include the concept of Christ as head of the Church and the whole conception of anointing and sealing, whether actual or metaphorical, in the early Church (see Grant, ad loc.; Corwin, op. cit., pp. 206f.). The earliest clear evidence for a ritual anointing is to be found in the Gnostic sects (see G.W.H. Lampe, The Seal of the Spirit. A Study in the Doctrine of Baptism and Confirmation in the New Testament and the Fathers, London, 1951, ch. 6, and cf., below, pp.497ff.), but the concept of anointing, including anointing as an eschatological seal, is relatively common in the early Church (see Lampe, op. cit., and L.L. Mitchell, Baptismal Anointing, London, 1966; Alcuin Club

One final aspect of the relationship between the Incarnate Lord and the new men of the Church who take their origin from him must be mentioned, and that is the union of flesh and spirit in the new man.⁽⁴⁵⁾ Ignatius is aware of a distinction between flesh and spirit: 'Men of flesh cannot act spiritually; nor can spiritual men act in a fleshly way' (Eph. 8.2). Nevertheless, man redeemed, while remaining in the flesh, is dominated by the spirit: 'But he for whom I am in bonds is my witness that I did not know it from any human being (ἀπὸ σαρκὸς ἀνθρώπου); the Spirit made proclamation, saying this: Do nothing apart from the bishop; keep your flesh as the temple of God; love unity; flee from divisions; be imitators of Jesus Christ, as he is of his Father.'⁽⁴⁶⁾ Redemption does not lead to a rejection of the flesh; it is the temple of God and Ignatius is even able to say, 'but what you do in relation to the flesh is spiritual, for you do everything in Jesus Christ' (Eph. 8.2). Far from seeing redemption as a rejection of the flesh, Ignatius stresses the union of flesh and spirit in redeemed man. This union is closely bound up with redemption through Christ:

- 44.(contd.) Collections 48, pp. 10 - 20). Special attention should be drawn to sections of the Gospel of Truth (20.30 - 34; 31.4 - 9; 33.39 - 34.34; 35.24 - 26; 36.18 - 34) in which the ideas of anointing, breathing imperishability and aroma are all to be found.
45. For what follows the whole of chapter 9 of Corwin's work on Ignatius should be consulted (pp. 247 - 71).
46. Phld. 7.2; cf. Pol. 2.2.

'To the holy church at Tralles of Asia - beloved by God the Father of Jesus Christ, elect and worthy of God, at peace in flesh and spirit through the passion of Jesus Christ.'
(Trall. pf.).

The union of the flesh and the spirit in redeemed man is bound up not only with redemption through the cross, but also with right belief about the nature of the Incarnate Lord: 'For I know that you are established in immovable faith, as if you were nailed in flesh and spirit to the cross of the Lord Jesus Christ and confirmed in love by the blood of Christ - being convinced concerning our Lord that he is truly of the family of David according to the flesh, Son of God by God's will and power, truly born of a virgin, baptized by John so that "all righteousness" might be "fulfilled" by him, truly nailed for us in the flesh under Pontius Pilate and the tetrarch Herod (from the tree's fruit are we, from his passion blessed by God)' (Smyrn. 1.1).

Does the thought of Ignatius go further than the ideas outlined above and see a connection between the nature of the redeemed man and the nature of the Incarnate Lord? If this were so then it could also be said that in association with the theme of salvation history, the idea that the nature of Christ is the basis for the nature of redeemed man could point to the Incarnation as the decisive event in man's historical development. From the point of view of Christology this cannot be supported. The unity of flesh and spirit which is so marked a feature of the Church⁽⁴⁷⁾

47. Magn. 1.2; 13.1; 13.2; Trall. 12.1; Rom. pf.; Smyrn.

does not play a significant part in Ignatius's understanding of the paradox of the humanity and divinity of Christ. Christ is born 'of the seed of David and of the Holy Spirit' (Eph. 18.2), but here the reference is only to his birth according to the flesh and by the agency of the Holy Spirit.⁽⁴⁸⁾ Nevertheless, 'flesh and spirit' does not refer simply to anthropology and ecclesiology in Ignatius; it is part of the paradox of the humanity and divinity of Christ. It is said of the risen Jesus: 'And after the resurrection he ate and drank with them as a being of flesh, though he was spiritually united with the Father' (Smyrn. 3.3). Writing to the Ephesians Ignatius says: 'There is one Physician: both flesh and spirit (*σαρκικός καὶ πνευματικός*), begotten and unbegotten (*γεννητὸς καὶ ἀγεννητός*), in man, God (*ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ θεός*), in death, true life, both from Mary and from God, first passible and then impassible, Jesus Christ our Lord.'⁽⁴⁹⁾ The divine-human paradox is clearly expressed this once in terms of flesh and spirit, but it does not here provide

47.(contd.) 13.2; Pol. 1.2; 5.1.

48. Cf. 'It would be interesting, but precarious, to connect the description of Jesus as "fleshly and spiritual" (Eph. 7.2) on the one hand with His human mother, and on the other with the Holy Spirit; what other agency could better make Jesus "spiritual"? But the reference is really to Jesus' own divine Pneuma' (G.L. Prestige, God in Patristic Thought, p. 82).

49. Eph. 7.2. Cf. Pol. 3.2.

the foundation for the unity of flesh and spirit in man redeemed. (50)

Is there, then, any relationship between the nature of the Incarnate Lord and the union of flesh and spirit in the believer? Virginia Corwin maintains that 'the unity within the human being is thought of as presaged by and dependent upon the unity of flesh and spirit that marked Jesus Christ.' (51) Corwin's argument begins from the fact

50. Harnack found evidence of a pneumatic Christology in Ignatius though he admitted that Ignatius's attention was fixed principally on the Incarnate Christ (History of Dogma, I, p. 192). This was contested by R. Seeberg (Text-Book of the History of Doctrines, ET, 2 vols, Grand Rapids, 1952, vol. 1, pp. 64f.) on the basis of the references to the pre-existence of Christ. The matter was put into proper perspective by A. Grillmeier (Christ in Christian Tradition. From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451), ET, London, 1965, pp. 103 - 5), who pointed out that the $\piνεῦμα - σὰρξ$ contrast indicated the recognition of two kinds of being, not a Spirit Christology, and the two kinds of reality refer to one and the same subject. The unity of Christ is never in question; the distinction is always maintained, but at the same time, the divine can be predicated of the human as in the expressions $\alphaἶμα θεοῦ$ (Eph. 1.1); $πάθος τοῦ θεοῦ μου$ (Rom. 6.3); etc. 'This way of speaking is possible only because the unity of the subject is recognized' (ibid., p. 105). On the divine-human paradox see also Grant (Apostolic Fathers, Ignatius, p. 8), Corwin (op. cit., pp. 92f.) and Rackl (op. cit., pp. 284 - 289).

51. op. cit., p. 258. Cf. 'L'unité de la chair et du Pneuma du Christ est le modèle de l'unité des Églises'

that, for Ignatius, man's predicament is characterised not as sin but as division; division in man, between men and, the most serious, between man and God (pp. 247f.). The source of any unity is God himself. To understand Ignatius' thoughts about unity Corwin examines his attitude to his own martyrdom (pp. 248 - 55), in which he hopes to attain to God,⁽⁵²⁾ and through participation in the sufferings of Christ to find him (Rom. 6.1). Also in his martyrdom he will become pure bread of Christ (Rom. 4.1) and will become a man through the perfect man.⁽⁵³⁾ Corwin then turns to the idea of a school of union (pp. 255 - 62), reaching in stages from obedience to the bishop and subjection to God, through the unity of flesh and spirit that is presaged in the unity of Christ, to the final union of man with God, a union that is far more than a simple moral union. The key to Miss Corwin's whole understanding of this is her exegesis of Magnesians 1.2: Ignatius prays that, in the churches, there may be 'ένωσιν σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ διὰ παντὸς ἡμῶν ζῆν, πίστεώς τε καὶ ἀγάπης, ἧς οὐδὲν προέκρίται, τὸ δὲ κυριώτερον, Ἰησοῦ καὶ πατρός.' The phrases that are important for our present purpose she translates as follows: 'a union

51.(contd) (J. Liébaert, L'Incarnation I: Dès origines au concile de Chalcédoine, Paris, 1966; - Histoire des dogmes Tome III, Fascicule I/a, p. 59).

52. Refs. in Corwin, op.cit., p. 252.

53. Rom. 6.2; Smyrn. 4.2.

with the flesh and spirit of Jesus Christ, a union of faith and love a union with Jesus and with the Father' (p. 261). Miss Corwin herself admits that the translation of genitives in Ignatius can be difficult (p. 259), but does her solution of this difficult passage bear close scrutiny? The parallel arrangement of the genitive phrases leads us to expect an identical use of the genitive in each case. In the first and third cases, Corwin translates 'union with' and this makes sense; but not in the second case, in which she says 'a union of faith and love'. Here it is the union of faith with love that is meant.⁽⁵⁴⁾ Also, in the first case, the meaning may be 'union of flesh with spirit' as is the case when Ignatius is talking about the Church. What, then, do we make of the third case above and of the genitive 'Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ' in the first case? Corwin rightly says that in view of Ignatius' stress on the unity of the Son and the Father it would be 'meaningless for him to pray that in the churches there may be a union of Jesus Christ and the Father' (p. 261). This, however, does not exclude the

54. A passage in Ephesians is quite explicit: 'None of this escapes your notice if you have perfect faith and love toward Jesus Christ; these are the beginning and the end of life, for the beginning is faith and the end is love. When the two exist in unity (ἐν ἑνότητι) it is God, and everything else related to goodness is the result' (Eph. 14.1).

possibility that Ignatius is thinking of a Jesus-and-the-Father kind of unity in the Churches, and that would indeed be most important.⁽⁵⁵⁾ In the first case above, if it is a union of flesh and spirit, how should the genitive 'of Jesus Christ' be understood? Lightfoot observes that to see here a reference to the flesh and spirit of Jesus⁽⁵⁶⁾ introduces an awkward repetition in the second reference to Jesus in the third case and also runs counter to the other references to unity of flesh and spirit, which refer to the Church, not to Christ. His solution is to translate: 'union of the flesh and of the spirit which are Jesus Christ's, our never-failing life.'

If the analysis that we have just given is correct, then there is in the above passage no direct reference to a union with the flesh and spirit of Christ nor to a union with Jesus and the Father; instead there is reference to the fact that the redeemed man belongs in flesh and spirit to Christ,⁽⁵⁷⁾ and a prayer that there may be experienced

55. Lightfoot (Ignatius ad loc.) does not see it exactly in this way, but speaks of the unity of the Father and Jesus, as 'the personal centre in which the unity resides, *Ἰησοῦ καὶ πατρός.*'

56. So Corwin, and also Grant, ad loc.

57. Cf. 'The frequent phrase *σὰρκὶ καὶ πνεύματι*, moreover, which expresses that inseparable relationship between body and soul so constantly stressed by Ignatius against the docetics, becomes in his style almost a synonym for "entirely".' (C.C. Richardson, op. cit., p. 48)

in the Church the quality of the union that is between Jesus and the Father. The union of flesh and spirit in man, therefore, is presaged in the nature of Christ, but it is not directly dependent upon it.⁽⁵⁸⁾ There is a full realization of the change for man brought about by the advent of Christ, it is closely allied to the fleshly and to the historical events of the passion of Christ, but there is no sign here of a sense of the development of man through history in which the Incarnation is the crucial event, nor of the nature of the Incarnate Lord as the primary basis for the anthropology of redeemed man.

Similar comments to those that we have made about the incarnate Lord can be made about the redemption that he brings.⁽⁵⁹⁾ Although the redemption is worked out strictly on the plane of history, and Ignatius emphasizes the reality of Christ's sufferings,⁽⁶⁰⁾ the redemptive events

58. As Richardson emphasises (op. cit., pp. 33 - 39) the unity between man and God according to Ignatius is primarily a moral union and there is never any suggestion that the union means other than a close personal fellowship. Union with God does not imply deification; it is closely bound up with obedience.

59. Our interest here is with redemption as an event in salvation history and not with the details of Ignatius's understanding of redemption as a whole, on which see, e.g. Corwin, op. cit., pp. 154 - 75.

60. E.g. Smyrn. 1 - 3.

intrude into history as a novelty, as the following passage in the epistle to the Ephesians expresses:

Both the virginity of Mary and her giving birth escaped the notice of the prince of this age, as did the Lord's death - three mysteries of a cry, wrought in the stillness of God. How then was he made manifest to the ages? A star shone forth in heaven brighter than all the stars; and its light was ineffable and its novelty produced astonishment; . . . There was perplexity as to the origin of this novelty so unlike the others. Thus all magic was dissolved and every bond of wickedness vanished; ignorance was abolished and the old kingdom was destroyed, since God was becoming manifest in human form for the newness of eternal life; what had been prepared by God had its beginning. Hence everything was shaken together, for the abolition of death was being planned. (Eph. 19).

Not all the features of this paragraph are of importance here.⁽⁶¹⁾ The references to 'the prince of this age' and 'the old kingdom' indicate a history preceeding the

61. On the three mysteries of a cry, wrought in the stillness of God, see e.g. Grant ad loc. and the literature cited there. Both Schlier (op. cit., pp. 5 - 32) and Bartsch (op. cit., pp. 133 - 59) see in this passage gnostic elements. Schlier in particular maintains that there are references here to the gnostic myth of the descent and ascent of the redeemer. This demands some special pleading about the interpretation of some words and phrases and the re-arrangement of the text. Corwin (op. cit., pp. 175 - 88) rejects such a gnostic interpretation and finds convincing parallels in Jewish material. The Jewish-Christian character of the passage has

Incarnation,⁽⁶²⁾ but in this Ignatius is not interested, neither as a negative salvation history in which man's history of sin is described, nor even as the scene of the divine saving acts leading up to the Incarnation. The Incarnation takes the Prince of this Age by surprise. In spite of the novelty of it all, however, the redemption had been planned beforehand by God, a point that we have already discussed. This redemption, moreover, is effective for those who, in time, preceded the Incarnation. The prophets who proclaimed the coming of Christ are saved by him, for they were Christ's disciples in the Spirit, 'and therefore when he came, he whom they rightly awaited raised them from the dead.'⁽⁶³⁾ Indeed, not only the prophets but the patriarchs as well enter with the Church to the Father through Christ (Phld. 9.1). Redemption takes place in accordance with a divine plan, it takes place in history, it is completely Christocentric, it is to some extent prepared for beforehand by the prophets,

- 61.(contd.) been further demonstrated by J. Daniélou (The Theology of Jewish Christianity, esp. pp. 207, 214, 217 and 220ff.). Schlier's use of the gnostic redeemer myth should also be read in the light of C. Colpe's work (Die religionsgeschichtliche Schule. Darstellung und Kritik ihres Bildes vom gnostischen Erlösersmythus, Göttingen, 1961;= FRLANT 78), the title of which speaks for itself.
62. On the world-view expressed in this passage see Corwin, op. cit., pp. 154ff.
63. Magn. 9.3. Cf. Phld. 5.2. The reference to the coming of Christ is not to the Incarnation, but to the descensus ad inferos. See Lightfoot, Ignatius, ad loc., Daniélou, op. cit., pp. 236f. On the theme of the

but the movement of history towards its apex in the Incarnation is not really Ignatius's concern; for him there is a strong element of novelty about the activity of God in Christ.

The role of Christ in the period of the Church calls for some brief comments only, since in general the relationship of Christ to the Church is not connected with salvation history.⁽⁶⁴⁾ The redemption brought by Christ institutes a new community, the basic element of which is the relationship between the believers as a group and Christ. This new community is the means for working out God's purposes; it is 'preordained before the ages'; it is 'elect'.⁽⁶⁵⁾ The readers of the epistle to the Ephesians are exhorted to remain in Christ Jesus,⁽⁶⁶⁾ and 'wherever Jesus Christ is, there is the whole Church' (Smyrn. 8.2). Ignatius's thought, however, ranges far wider than this; the unity of Christ with the Father is the pattern of the unity between the bishop and his flock, as is well-expressed in the following: 'For if in a short time I had

63.(contd.) decensus in general see B. Reicke, The Disobedient Spirits and Christian Baptism (Copenhagen, 1946) and W. Bieder, Die Vorstellung von der Höllenfahrt Jesu Christi (Zürich, 1949), esp. ch. 3.

64. See further, e.g. Corwin op. cit., pp. 189 - 204.

65. Eph. pf.; Trall. pf. Cf. Corwin, op. cit., p. 191.

66. E.g. Eph. 10. 3.

such fellowship with your bishop as was not human but spiritual, how much more blessed do I consider you who are mingled with him as the Church is with Jesus Christ and as Jesus Christ is with the Father, so that all things are harmonious in unison'.⁽⁶⁷⁾ The Church is nothing if not Christocentric. Associated with this there is a strong element of the imitation of Christ in the life of the Church and the individual.⁽⁶⁸⁾ The Philadelphians are urged, 'Be imitators of Jesus Christ, as he is of his Father' (Phld. 7.2). Ignatius himself begs the Romans: 'Let me be an imitator of the passion of my God' (Rom. 6.3).

There is a close connection between Christ, the sacraments and salvation in Ignatius. In the case of Baptism the connection between Christ and the sacrament is historical, being based on the baptism of Christ. He was 'baptised by John so that "all righteousness" might be "fulfilled" by him' (Smyrn. 1.1), and 'in order to purify the water by the passion' (Eph. 18.1). As Daniélou says of the latter passage: 'The most natural explanation of these expressions is that Christ by descending into the water destroyed the demonic forces that dwelt in it, thus purifying them by his Passion, that is to say, by his death, which is a descent into

67. Eph. 5.1. See M. Villain, 'Une vive conscience de l'unité du corps mystique: St. Ignace d'Antioche et St. Irénée', in Revue pratique d'apologétique 66 (1938). pp. 257 - 71, esp. pp. 258 65.

68. See Grant, Apostolic Fathers, vol. 4, pp. 10ff.; Corwin, op. cit., pp. 227 - 37.

the world of death.' (69) Christ's baptism, then is the authorisation for Christian baptism. Unfortunately Ignatius does not say enough for us to draw any conclusions about the relationship of baptism to the participation in salvation, and hence its place as a means of participating in salvation history is impossible to determine.

Ignatius' thinking on the Eucharist is much clearer. There are no direct references to the Last Supper as the authority for the Eucharist, but the references to the sacrament are absolutely clear on the reality of the presence of Christ in it. (70) What is important as far as the present study is concerned is that the Eucharist is one of the means by which the believer, and only the believer, (71) may participate in salvation. The redemption worked out in history is shared in through another concrete act. The Eucharist is bound up with the passion and resurrection of Christ (Smyrn. 7.1) and with sharing in the benefits of that redemption (Phld. 4.1); it shows forth the perfection of faith and love that were in Christ and which the Christian must imitate; (72) above all, it is

69. op. cit., p. 226. From the evidence given by Daniélou the association of Baptism with the passion was clearly a feature of Jewish Christianity.

70. E.g. Smyrn. 7.1.

71. Those who walk in strange doctrine have no share in the passion (Phld. 3.3), and the Eucharist is a sharing in the passion (ibid., 4.1). The Docetists abstain from the Eucharist (Smyrn. 7.1).

72. Trall. 8.1; Rom. 7.3.

an act of union with Christ, for the Eucharist is 'the medicine of immortality, the antidote which results not in dying but in living forever in Jesus Christ',⁽⁷³⁾ and it is 'the bread of God, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ (who was of the seed of David)' (Rom. 7.3). This does not mean that Ignatius sees the Eucharist as part of the unfolding of the divine salvation history, for history as such is not thought of at this point;⁽⁷⁴⁾ but in the Eucharist is emphasised the realisation in concrete terms of the presence of Christ in the Church. To see the Eucharist as part of salvation history will depend on whether the history to which it is related is seen as salvation history in the process of being unfolded.

The relationship between Christ and the Church, however, is not simply a static relationship, it is moving towards a goal, both on the individual and corporate levels. Ignatius says of himself: 'For even though I am in bonds for the Name, I am not yet perfect in Jesus Christ' (Eph. 3.1). And again: 'I am exceedingly joyful to be watching out for your safety - not I, but Jesus Christ,

73. Eph. 20.2. Attention is usually focused on the words 'medicine' and 'antidote', but the last phrase makes it clear that this is not to be seen apart from union in Christ. See also Corwin, op. cit. p. 210.

74. Ignatius, however, is aware of the connection not only between the passion and the Eucharist but of the connection between the historical Jesus and the Christ of faith encountered in the Eucharist; the bread of God which Ignatius desires is 'of the seed of David' (Rom. 7.3).

for whom I am in bonds, though I fear all the more because I am still imperfect. But your prayer to God will make me perfect, so that I may attain to the lot in which I was given mercy, fleeing to the gospel as to the flesh of Jesus and to the apostles as to the presbytery of the church.'⁽⁷⁵⁾ The goal of his perfection is to 'attain to God'.⁽⁷⁶⁾ The Church likewise is moving towards a goal. Movement and progress to a goal are constituent elements of the metaphor of the Church as a building under construction (Eph. 9.1), and the end in view is the promised union with God Himself (Trall. 11.2). The Christocentricity of the hope of the Church is expressed by the description of Christ as 'our Hope'.⁽⁷⁷⁾

A study of Christocentric salvation history in Ignatius of Antioch yields a somewhat complicated result. On the one hand there is the clear recognition of a divine plan that is conceived by God and put into action with the Incarnation, and also the activity of the prophets in pointing to the Incarnation. Both of these are centred on Christ and His Incarnation. On the other hand, the Incarnation is seen as a novelty, and it marks a point of discontinuity between the old and the new. Furthermore, although he has been with God from before the worlds, Christ

75. Phld. 5.1. Cf. Rom. 1.1f.

76. Smyrn. 11.1. Cf. Rom. 6.1; Trall. 13.3. See above p. 98.

77. Eph. 21.2; Magn. 11; Trall. pf.; 2.2; Phld. 11.2.

plays no role in any of the events before the Incarnation. The divine plan, in spite of the references to the prophets, is related almost exclusively to the Incarnation. In the Incarnation Christ renews man in the unity of flesh and spirit, but there is no suggestion that there was any association between Christ and man prior to the Incarnation. In the Church there are further signs of a movement towards God and this is undoubtedly Christocentric, for the Church's life is founded solely in Christ. In all, this shows insufficient development to warrant description as Christocentric salvation history. (78)

78. Cf. 'Ici (sc. in Ignatius), l'histoire a donc un sens, mais elle est une pure continuité plutôt qu'un tout organique, et les âges se remplacent plutôt qu'ils ne s'appellent: Ignace ne cherche pas à montrer le progrès d'une foi qui se développe, mais la constance d'une foi identique, celle au Christ, principe de salut' (A. Luneau, L'Histoire du Salut chez les Pères de l'Eglise. La Doctrine des Ages du Monde, Paris, 1964; = Théologie Historique 2, p. 88).

III THE EPISTLE OF BARNABAS

This epistle, ascribed to Barnabas and emanating probably from Alexandria in the early years of the second century AD, (79) is one of the most interesting documents

79. On general questions of introduction see e.g.

of the early Church when approached from the point of view of salvation history. One of the author's principal concerns is the relationship of the past of the Old Testament to the present of the gospel.⁽⁸⁰⁾ The relationship is both a positive one and a negative one. We shall examine the negative aspect first.

The negative relationship between the old and the new man can be seen, for example, in what Barnabas⁽⁸¹⁾ has to say about the Covenant, the Law and the Temple.⁽⁸²⁾

79.(contd.) R.A. Kraft, in Grant's Apostolic Fathers, vol. 3, and F.L. Cross, The Early Christian Fathers, pp. 21 - 23.

80. According to Kraft (op. cit., pp. 22 - 39) the two major themes of the work are 'gnosis' and eschatology, that is, 'a special understanding of God's action in human history, and a vivid consciousness of living in the last times' (p. 22). This special understanding or 'gnosis' is of two kinds: an exegetical gnosis, 'which enables the recipient better to understand salvation-history' and an ethical gnosis, 'which is the correct understanding of the Lord's requirements for conduct' (ibid., p. 24, and see pp. 22 - 27).

81. The name 'Barnabas' is retained for convenience and to avoid the somewhat clumsy alternative, 'Pseudo-Barnabas'.

82. On the Church's attitude to the Old Testament cf. Harnack: The Church, understanding itself as the true people of God, took up one of two attitudes to Judaism: that there never had been a covenant between God and Israel; that there was a covenant but it had been misinterpreted. 'Israel was thus at all times the pseudo-Church The Patriarchs, Prophets, and men of God, however, who were favoured with the

With regard to the covenant, Barnabas sees in the blessing of Ephraim, the younger, rather than Manasseh, the first-born, and in the righteousness ascribed to Abraham solely on account of faith, an indication that the Church and not the Jews were the real inheritors of the covenant (ch.13). He goes on to discuss the actual bestowing of the covenant, pointing out that Moses received the two tables of the covenant, but that the people of Israel were not found worthy. Barnabas then considers how the covenant came to the Church: 'Moses received it in the capacity of servant, but the Lord himself gave it to us, to a "people" of inheritance, by submitting for us. And he was made manifest so that they might fill up the measure of their sins, and we might receive it through Jesus, who inherits the Lord's covenant - he was prepared for this reason, that by appearing himself and liberating from darkness our hearts which had already been paid over to death and given over to the lawlessness of error, he might establish a covenant in us by a word. For it is written how the Father commanded him to prepare a holy people for himself when he had liberated us from the darkness' (14. 4 - 6). Several features of this passage should be noted: in the first place, the saving act of God in the bestowal of the covenant does not simply provide Barnabas with a point of comparison between the

82.(contd.) communication of God's words, have nothing inwardly in common with the Jewish people' (History of Dogma, vol. 1, p. 179). On the attitude of Barnabas to O.T. cf. P. Richardson, Israel in the Apostolic Church (Cambridge, 1969 ; = Soc. NTS Monographs 10), pp. 20 f.

old and the new; Jesus is the inheritor of the covenant that was offered to the people of Israel through Moses but of which they were not worthy; it is the same covenant in both cases. Secondly, the negative aspect of salvation history that can be seen in this double offering of the covenant is to be observed in the fact that the people of Israel were unworthy of the covenant and, with the manifestation of Christ, the sins of Israel were perfected; alongside of the salvation history that is seen in Moses and in Jesus, there is a parallel history of damnation as well.⁽⁸³⁾ The third point to be noted is the emphasis that is laid on the preparation, on the plan of God with reference to the manifestation of Christ. God prepared beforehand for the coming of Christ for the purpose of redeeming our hearts out of darkness and preparing a holy people for Himself. As such, the plan is Christocentric even though Christ appears as the inheritor of the covenant from Moses. The covenant lost by the people of Israel but gained by the Church is mentioned at an earlier point in the epistle (4. 6 - 8), but in less detail, and there also the covenants are distinct and contrasted. Also circumcision in relation to the covenant is contrasted with circumcision of the heart, (9. 1 - 6) but there the interest is on the contrast as such, not on the movement from one to the other.

83. Cf. 'The history of Israel is the reverse of what God has now done through Jesus' (Kraft, op. cit., p. 33; Cf. also R.L.P. Milburn, op. cit., p. 24).

The law with regard to sacrifices and oblations is given a similar negative appreciation in the epistle as well. Barnabas cites Is.1. 11 - 13 to show that the prophets taught that God did not want sacrifices (2. 5), and he goes on to say, 'therefore he set these things aside, so that the new law of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is not tied to a yoke of necessity might have its own offering which is not man-made' (2. 6). The point is not elaborated in the way that the discussion about the covenant was, but the same contrast between the old of the Law and the new of the gospel in Christ is there. (84)

The old and the new in respect of the temple is developed in some detail (ch.16). Barnabas first considers the destruction of the Temple as being in accordance with the will of God, and then turns to the real nature of the temple of God, which is man himself, who becomes a temple of God: 'When we receive the forgiveness of sins and place our hope on the Name we become new, created again from the beginning. Wherefore God truly dwells in our "dwelling place" - in us' (16:8). The contrast between the temples lacks both the historical and Christocentric emphases of the contrast in the covenants; Barnabas's interest here lies solely on the nature of the true temple of God. There is also no thought here of God's plan for the building of the new temple. The fact that neither the Law nor the Temple is understood in

exactly the same way as the Covenant should warn us that not too much weight should be given to the appearance of the Christocentric salvation history in Barnabas's understanding of the covenant; but on the other hand it is not to be denied.

Already we have seen, in the relationship of Jesus to Moses with regard to the covenant, that there is a positive aspect to the salvation history, as well as the negative aspect.⁽⁸⁵⁾ This positive side is greatly emphasised in the role played by the prophets in the prediction of the events of Jesus' life, death and resurrection (6.7; 7.1). A considerable part of the epistle is given over to exegesis of the passages in the prophets that were thought to refer to Christ. It is important at this point to understand what is implied about salvation history in the understanding of the statements of the prophets as typological references to Christ. The fact that Barnabas sees some statements of the prophets typologically fulfilled in Christ implies some understanding of a divine plan and of a preparation for future events. This is true even when Barnabas's interest is fixed entirely on the comparison between the statement of the prophet and its fulfilment in Christ, without explicit reference to the fact that the divine act was in preparation. However, this does not of itself imply that the plan as it

85. Kraft over-emphasises the negative aspect (as does Seeberg, *op. cit.*, 1, p. 72). He is correct with regard to the people of Israel and their counter-part the Church, but the patriarchs and prophets are part of salvation history. Cf. also P. Richardson, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

is revealed in the prophets is to be regarded as salvation history. The prophecy points to God's saving act in history, but the prophecy itself need have no saving significance apart from the event to which it points. Likewise, the Christocentricity of the salvation history and indeed of the divine plan itself may stem solely from the fact that the event pointed to and the plan to be worked out are related to the Christ event; Christ comes into it, then, only as the end to which the prophecy and the plan are directed. As an example of what is meant, we can look to the exegesis of the act of Abraham in circumcising his 318 servants: 'For when Abraham first gave circumcision, he circumcised while looking forward in the spirit to Jesus, and he received the teachings of the three letters. For it says: And Abraham circumcised the men of his household, 18 and 300 (in number).'⁽⁸⁶⁾ The interpretation given of this is that the 18 refers to Jesus (IH in Greek numerals) and the 300 to the cross (T, in Greek numerals). The circumcision as such has no significance at all, indeed Barnabas specifically rejects it (9. 1 - 6). In this case, the circumcision is not part of the divine salvation history, though in administering it Abraham looked to Jesus and therefore made known the plan of God with regard to Jesus and the cross; it is Christocentric only in so far as it takes its meaning from the event which follows. While, then, a divine plan is unfolded in the prophecies about

86. Barn. 9.7f. (Cf. Gen. 17.23)

Jesus, we must look elsewhere for evidence of the salvation history in the sense of history unfolding in accordance with the divine plan of salvation, and also for evidence of Christocentricity in the activity of Christ in history.

In the Epistle of Barnabas the prophecy is not only Christocentric in that it applies to Christ, but in that it is directed by Christ. This is perfectly clear in what is said about the vinegar and the gall given Christ on the cross, and about the scape-goat (7. 3 - 11). In the explanation of the statement, 'And they shall eat from the goat that is offered up during the Fast for all sins, . . . and the priests alone shall eat the entrails unwashed, with vinegar,' (a quotation from an unknown source),⁽⁸⁷⁾ it is Christ himself who speaks: 'Since you are to give me, who am destined to offer my flesh for the sins of my new people, gall with vinegar to drink, eat you alone, while the people fast and smite themselves in sackcloth and ashes.' To this Barnabas adds: 'this is to demonstrate that he must suffer at their hands.'⁽⁸⁸⁾ Christ himself is not only the object of the prophecy but the one who directs it; He gives the law and looks to its typological fulfilment. The next section begins: 'Pay attention to what he commanded' (7.6). 'He' clearly means Christ. There are other cases in the epistle where it is said that 'He' spoke through the prophets,⁽⁸⁹⁾ but nowhere more clearly than here can it be

87. Barn. 7.4. See Kraft, ad loc.

88. Barn. 7.5. The translation has been altered to retain the double accusative after $\pi\omicron\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma\epsilon\iota\nu$.

89. E.g. Barn. 2.9.

seen that 'He' is Christ. In other cases it is sometimes the Father⁽⁹⁰⁾ or the Lord.⁽⁹¹⁾

The details of the typological exegesis of the Old Testament do not concern us here⁽⁹²⁾ and we pass on to an examination of the Incarnation and redemption in relation to salvation history. The most extended passage in this regard is in chapter 5, where Barnabas answers the question, Why did Christ suffer at the hands of men? Barnabas answers as follows:

The prophets, after they had received special insight from him, prophesied concerning him. And he submitted so that he might break the power of Death and demonstrate the resurrection from the dead - thus it was necessary for him to be manifested in flesh. Also (he submitted) so that he might fulfil the promise to the fathers and, while he was preparing the new

90. E.g. Barn. 2.9

91. Barn. 2.4; 3.1; 4.8; 6.1; 9.1; 11.1; 11.6. The use of 'Lord' is inconclusive of itself, for Barnabas uses the title of both the Father and Christ (Refs. in Kraft, op. cit., pp. 36f.). The confusion in the use of titles does not mean that Barnabas confuses Christ and God; they are distinct though the attributes are shared and their action is one. See Lebreton, op. cit., pp. 337ff.

92. On the Old Testament quotations as evidence of traditional material in Barnabas, see Kraft, op. cit., pp. 19 - 22. In spite of this fact there are certain basic themes that run through the work as a whole (See Kraft, op. cit., p. 22). On OT exegesis see esp. Daniélou, op. cit., pp. 89 - 115, and on traditional material and testimonia, see esp. P. Prigent, op. cit., and L.W. Barnard, Studies in the Apostolic Fathers, pp. 109 - 35.

people for himself and while he was still on earth, to prove that after he has brought about the resurrection he will judge. Furthermore, although he was teaching Israel and doing such great wonders and signs, the result was not that they loved him dearly for his preaching.⁽⁹³⁾ But when he chose his own apostles who were destined to preach his gospel - men who were sinful beyond measure so that he might prove that he came not to call righteous but sinners - it was then that he revealed himself as God's Son. For if he had not come in flesh, how could men be saved by looking at him, . . . Thus the Son of God came in flesh for this reason, that he might bring to summation the total of sins of those who persecuted his prophets to death (5.6 - 11).

In confirmation of what was said in the previous paragraph, it should be noticed that the prophets receive grace from Christ. With regard to the Incarnation, Barnabas sees the coming of Christ in the flesh as necessitated on account of the resurrection of the dead, since resurrection is something that applies to the flesh, and also on account of man, since man could not bear to look upon Christ as he really is. In spite of this insistence on the real Incarnation, Barnabas rejects the idea that Jesus is the son of a man (i.e. mere man), for he is Son of God and addressed as 'Lord' by David; he was 'manifested in flesh by a type (τύπῳ δὲ ἐν σαρκὶ φανερωθείς)' (12.10) There is in this last statement a suggestion if not of docetism at least of the idea that in his essential nature Christ is divine. Christ's body is 'the vessel of the spirit' (7.3;

93. On the text here see Kraft, ad loc. Some textual witnesses omit the negative and yield the result that either Christ loved Israel or that Israel loved Christ.

11.9) and the opposition between flesh and spirit stressed in this way sheds light on the insistence that Christ was manifested in the flesh.⁽⁹⁴⁾ This manifestation in flesh of a pre-existent divine Being is referred to by Harnack as pneumatic Christology.⁽⁹⁵⁾ At this point the Incarnation is not directly related to salvation history.

The redemption brought about through the Incarnation is clearly seen as taking place within a scheme of salvation history. Christ came to 'redeem the promise made to the fathers', and then there are the references to the 'new people prepared for himself' and the coming exercise of Judgement. Furthermore, he taught Israel, but also 'came in flesh . . . that he might recapitulate (ἀνακεφαλαιώσῃ) the total of sins of those who persecuted his prophets to death' (5.11). It was for this work that Christ came in the flesh, and there is no doubt here that Christ is the centre of the movement of history from the people of Israel who proved unworthy of

94. Barn. 5.6; 6.7, 9, 14; 12.10f. See Grillmeier, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

95. Harnack, History of Dogma, I, pp. 189 - 99, esp. pp. 192, 195 in relation to Barnabas. Harnack maintains that the future belonged to the pneumatic Christology rather than to the adoptionist one of Hermas (on which see below p. 134), because, among other things, 'it alone permitted the close connection between creation and redemption . . . On the other hand, no direct and natural relation to the world and to universal history could be given to the Adoptionist Christology, which was originally determined eschatologically' (*ibid.*, p. 197).

the covenant to the new people, the Church. The history in fact looks forward also to the coming Judgement by the risen Lord. There is a precise line of salvation history from the promises to the fathers, through the unfaithfulness of Israel, through the Incarnation of Christ himself, to the Apostles and on to the Church and the final Judgement. At the centre of this movement is Christ. Even the negative movement is to be noted, that too being centred on Christ in the ultimate sin of the rejection of Him.⁽⁹⁶⁾ Recapitulation will be met again in Irenaeus.

Salvation History reaches its widest implications in the Epistle of Barnabas in relation to creation. In the first place it is made clear that the incarnate Lord is none other than the one to whom God said, 'Let us make man in accord with our image and likeness' (Gen. 1.26),⁽⁹⁷⁾ and in a long section the comparison of creation and re-creation is worked out in detail (6. 8 - 19). Christ not only assisted at the creation of man, but He also re-creates man through the redemption that he brings: 'For man is land suffering, for Adam was formed from the face of the land. . . . Since then, he renovated us by the forgiveness of sins, he made us to be another sort (of creation), as though we had a child's soul - he fashioned us again. For the scripture is speaking about us when he says to the Son; "Let us make man in accord with our image and likeness, and let them rule . . .". And when he saw how well we were formed the Lord said: "Increase and multiply and fill the earth." . . . He made a second fashioning in

96. Cf. what was said above about the covenant (pp. 166f.)

the last times . . . It is for this reason, therefore, that the prophet proclaimed: "Enter into the land flowing with milk and honey, and exercise lordship over it." See, then, we have been fashioned anew! As he says again in another prophet: "Behold, says the Lord, I will remove from them . . . their stony hearts, and will insert fleshly hearts." Because he was about to be manifested in flesh and to dwell in us. For, my brethren, our heart being thus inhabited, constitutes a holy Temple to the Lord! . . . We therefore are those whom he conducts into the good land . . . But as it was already said above; "And they shall increase, and multiply, and rule over the fish." . . . If, then, this is not the present situation, he had told us when it will be - when we ourselves have been perfected as heirs of the Lord's covenant' (6. 9 - 19). The essence of the argument presented here is plain, as is its connection with salvation history, Christ created man and re-created him through redemption and dwells in the redeemed man as in a temple. The movement of salvation history does not stop there, however, but looks forward to the perfection of man when he may become an heir of the covenant of the Lord. In this movement Christ plays an essential role, not only in the redemption, but also in creation, and in indwelling his new creation, the Church. The eschatological orientation

97. Barn. 5.5. On the exegesis of Gen.1.26 see R.McL. Wilson 'The Early History of the Exegesis of Genesis 1.26', in Studia Patriastica I (Berlin, 1957, = TU 63) pp. 420 - 37.

apparent in this movement gives to the ethical demands of the epistle a compelling urgency. (98)

That history has a goal towards which it is moving is emphasised elsewhere in the epistle. (99) 'The great final scandal is at hand . . . For the Master cut short the times and the days for this reason, that his Beloved One might hasten and come into his inheritance' (4.3). In connection with the true Sabbath of the Lord as opposed to the false Sabbath of the Jews, Barnabas refers first of all to the Sabbath of the creation, and explains: 'Therefore, children, "in six days", - in six thousand years - "everything" will be finished. "And he rested on the seventh day." He is saying this: When his Son comes he will put an end to the time of the Lawless One, and judge the impious, and change the sun and moon and stars - then he will truly rest "on the seventh day"' (15.4f.). Furthermore, the command to hallow it with pure hands and heart will be fulfilled only 'when we ourselves are able (to do so) since we have been made righteous and have received the promise - when lawlessness is no more and all things have been made new by the Lord, - at that time we will be able to keep it holy, when we ourselves first have been made holy ' (15.7). The only Sabbath that is acceptable to the Lord is 'that which

98. Cf. 'Salvation in Barnabas is primarily a future reward which will be granted to the person who meets the divine requirements of righteousness at the coming judgement' (Kraft, op. cit., p. 32).

99. On the eschatological atmosphere of the work see Kraft, op. cit., pp. 27 - 29.

I have made, in which, when I have rested everything, I will make the beginning of an eighth day - that is, the beginning of another world. Wherefore also we observe the eighth day as a time of rejoicing, for on it Jesus both rose from the dead and, when he had appeared, ascended into the heavens' (15.8f.). The history of salvation, then, moves towards its goal,⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ and there too Christ plays a dominant role, already fore-shadowed in the resurrection.⁽¹⁰¹⁾

The Epistle of Barnabas has a well-defined Christocentric salvation history: the acts of God in the history of salvation move from creation to the final consummation, and at every stage Christ has an important part to play, above all, of course, in the Incarnation and redemption, but also in creation, revelation through the prophets and in the life of the Church and the consummation. In the Incarnation and redemption the themes of salvation history are taken up, in particular the theme of creation and re-creation and the

100. It is to be noted that the goal in Barnabas is quite simply the Sabbath of God; although the duration of the world is interpreted as 6,000 years, there is no suggestion here that the sabbath rest constitutes a seventh period of 1,000 years. There are only two details of time; the 6,000 years and the day of rest. See A. Luneau, *op. cit.*, p. 84, and Daniélou, *op. cit.*, pp. 396ff.

101. The association of the ascension with the resurrection on the same day (cf. St. John), instead of being a separate event in the drama of salvation history, is a feature that Daniélou regards as Jewish-Christian (*op. cit.*, p. 250).

idea of establishing a new people of God, a people worthy of the covenant through the redemption brought them by Christ. The pattern of the salvation history is both negative and positive; positive in the line from creation through the prophets to Christ, to the new people of God, to the consummation; and negative in the failure of the original people of God and the culmination of their sin in the crucifixion of Jesus. The idea of a divine plan being worked out is implied in the understanding of prophecy, but it is not developed in any detail of its own. (102)

IV THE SHEPHERD OF HERMAS

Hermas⁽¹⁰³⁾ is preoccupied with the Church, so much so,

102. Cf. with reference to Barnabas, 'l'histoire religieuse de l'humanité comporte donc diverses périodes, mais non pas divers testaments; il n'y a donc pas, au sens strict, divers âges' (Luneau, op. cit., p. 87). This requires a little qualification. With regard to the absence in Barnabas of an idea of successive covenants and of successive ages that represent stages of development, Luneau is correct. This does not mean, however, that Barnabas is unaware of the movement of history and of God's activity in that history, in preparation and fulfilment, moving towards a goal; that he is unaware of salvation history.
103. On questions of general introduction see e.g. F.L. Cross (The Early Christian Fathers, pp. 23 - 27), R.M. Grant, (Apostolic Fathers, vols 1 and 6), Daniélou (op. cit., pp. 36 - 39). The text used is that edited by Molly Whittaker, Die apostolischen Väter I Der Hirt des Hermas (Berlin 1956; = GCS 48), and her division of the text is likewise adopted. For the purposes of the present study

that he even sees that creation takes place because of the Church.⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ In the work as a whole, however, Hermas's concern is ethical; with the life of the Church in contemporary Roman society. Questions of theology are subordinated to this concern. Christology in the work, interesting though it is, is incidental to the main purpose. We do not intend even to deal with all the Christology in detail here, but only with those aspects of it that are amenable to an approach from the point of view of salvation history.⁽¹⁰⁵⁾ Indications of an interest in salvation history

103.(contd.) we accept the opinion endorsed by Cross, Daniélou and G.F. Snyder (Grant, Apostolic Fathers, vol.6) that the work went through several stages of composition between c. 96 and c. 140 AD. The more detailed conclusions of S. Giet (Hermas et les Pasteurs. Les trois auteurs du Pasteur d'Hermas, Paris, 1963) merit consideration, though they are drawn with more precision than the evidence will probably allow in a work of this nature. See the review by J. Daniélou (RSR 52, 1964, pp. 103 - 07), and cf. Giet's rejoinder: "Un courant judéo - chrétien à Rome au milieu du IIe siècle" in Aspects du Judéo-Christianisme. Colloque de Strasbourg 23 - 25 Avril 1964 (Paris, 1965), pp. 95 - 111.

104.Pastor 1.6; 3.4; 8.1; 11.3 - 12.1. Cf. 47.2. The pre-existence of the Church 'constitutes the characteristic mark of Jewish Christian theology in this regard' (Daniélou, op. cit., p. 297; and see pp. 294 - 301, esp. 296 - 99). In Hermas, creation is the work of God, and Christ has no role in it.

105.As we shall see below, only Similitude 9 shows any awareness of salvation history, consequently we shall not discuss the 'Angel'-Christology and the identification of the Son of God with Michael in Similitude 8

in the work are few. In fact, even at points where we might expect to find some indications of it, it is absent. For example, in the parable of the vineyard⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ the planting and organization of the vineyard is not interpreted as a parable of the divine activity in history, as is the case in St. Matthew (21. 33 - 41); the emphasis lies rather on the hard labour required in the cultivation of the vineyard. So also in the vision of the building of the tower,⁽¹⁰⁷⁾ the interest lies not in the process of building, which might have led to a theory of salvation history, but in the constitution of the tower. Likewise in the parable of the willow tree,⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ the interest is ethical and not on the growth of the tree.

In Similitude 9 (chh. 78 - 110), however, there are signs of an interest in salvation history⁽¹⁰⁹⁾ and we shall

105. (contd.) except insofar as these points are raised by the salvation history of Similitude 9.

106. Pastor 54 - 60 (= Similitude 5).

107. Pastor 9 - 12 (= Vision 3).

108. Pastor 67 - 77 (= Similitude 8)

109. The appearance of salvation history in this Similitude only is but one of the indications that this similitude may be a later addition to the work. The evidence is briefly set out by G.F. Snyder (op. cit., pp. 4 - 7):

(1) Similitude 8 ends with a reference to 'the rest' ($\tau\alpha\lambda\omicron\gamma\pi\alpha$), as though what followed was distinct from the Mandates and Similitudes that preceeded;

(2) Similitude 9 opens with a reference to the Mandates and Similitudes as a collected group; (3) Pastor 25.5 contains a reference to Mandates, Similitudes and 'other things'; (4) Similitude 9 is distinctly more Christological than the remainder of the work; (5) The

examine the similitude briefly here and the Christology of the work as a whole where possible connections with it may be found. The Similitude is a composite piece, the parable of the tower forming an insertion in the parable of the twelve mountains; (110) there is also some additional material about the stones of the tower (106. 4 - 110) that perhaps attests even further development. The parable of the tower, which is our principal concern here, is itself a development of the vision of the tower. (111) There are several marked differences between the vision and the parable, notably in a greater interest in Christology and salvation history in the parable. (112) Even in the parable, however, the principal interest is ethical, and above all in a need for repentance. Nevertheless, both Christology and salvation history are important.

In the parable itself, reference is made to the rock: 'In the middle of the plain he showed me a great white rock which had risen up out of the plain. And the rock was higher than the mountains and square, so as to contain the entire world. And that rock was old, with a portico carved

109.(contd) similitude is clearly a re-interpretation of Vision 3, and this re-interpretation is marked by a clear awareness of the presence in the Church of some who are unrepentant and by a stricter attitude to ecclesiastical form. Exactly how this evidence is to be interpreted is open to debate, and this cannot be pursued here. Clearly, however, Similitude 9 has a certain distinctiveness. The major study of the question is that by S. Giet (op. cit., pp. 78f., 102 - 7, 139 - 79); cf. also Lebreton, op. cit., pp. 378 - 87.

out of it, but it seemed to me the carving of the portico was recent. And the portico was more radiant than the sun, so that I marvelled at the brightness of the portico' (79.1f.). Later, the Shepherd explains the meaning of the rock and its portico to Hermas: 'This rock and the portico are the Son of God'. When Hermas cannot understand how the rock can be old and the portico new, the Shepherd continues: 'The Son of God is older than all of his creation, so that he was counsellor to his Father in his creation. That is why the rock is old . . . He became manifest at the last days of the consummation; that is why the portico is new, so that those about to be saved may enter through it into the kingdom of God' (89.1 - 3). In the parable, Hermas had seen a tower being built upon the rock and portico (80.1), and this too the Shepherd explains: 'This tower is the Church' (90.1), and it is built on the rock and the portico because 'the name of the Son of God is great and incomprehensible and supports the whole world. If, then, all creation is sustained by the Son of God; what do you suppose about those who have been called by him and bear the name of the Son of God and live by his commandments? Do you see, then, what sort he supports? Those who bear his name whole-heartedly. So he has become a foundation for them and he supports them gladly, because they were not ashamed to bear his name' (91.5). Christ is the foundation of the Church;

110. The tower: Pastor 79 - 93; The mountains: 78, 94 - 106.3.

111. Pastor 9 - 21 (= Vision 3)

112. Further comparisons are given by Snyder in his comments to Similitude 9.

more than that even, he is the one who supports the whole world and is of such a size as to contain the entire world; Christ is not only the foundation of those who bear his name, but is at the heart of the universe itself.⁽¹¹³⁾ This Christocentricity is expressed not only in terms of Christ as the foundation but also in terms of chronology; Christ is older than his creation and was counsellor to the Father in creation, and he became manifest at the last days of the consummation and is therefore both old and new. In these references to time and to the old and the new, we have hints of a salvation history, at the centre of which is Christ.

Salvation history from the very fact that it is concerned with history is to a large extent pre-occupied with the past, but not exclusively, for it looks to the future development of history as the fulfilment of the saving activity of God. The attitude to the present in a scheme of salvation history includes an appeal to those who live in that period to associate themselves with the divine purpose in history.

113. Daniélou sees here evidence of Jewish-Christian speculation on the Name of God as an hypostasis that is identified with the Son or Word. As the text stands, 'the name of the Son of God' stands for the person of the Son of God, but Daniélou suggests that the original form had simply 'the Name of God is great'; thus Christ as the Name of God bears the world, and the Christian bears the name of him who is the foundation of all (op. cit., pp. 151 - 57). See also R.N. Longenecker, The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity (London, 1970; = Studies in Biblical Theology, second series 17), pp. 41 - 46. Cf. Ev.Ver. 38.6 - 40.29.

That this is so can be illustrated from the Shepherd of Hermas in the fact that the tower being built on the foundation of the Son of God is incomplete (82.2). In Hermas this leads to a call to repentance before it is too late.⁽¹¹⁴⁾ It also includes the warning of judgement, in the inspection of the tower by its lord prior to its completion (82.2). The arrival of the lord of the tower to inspect it is described: 'And behold, a little later I saw a procession of many men coming. And in their midst was a man so tall that he rose above the tower. And six men who had supervised the construction walked with him at his right and at his left, and all the ones who had worked on the building were with him and many other glorious beings were around him' (83.1f.). The inspection is then described in detail (83.2 - 8). 'So when the glorious man, the lord of the entire tower, had finished these things, he called the shepherd and turned over to him all the stones which were lying beside the tower . . . ' (84.1). He gives the shepherd instructions regarding these stones and then leaves with his entourage. This lofty figure, the glorious man, is later identified as the Son of God (89.8); without his name it is impossible to enter the kingdom of God (89.4f.), even for the angels.⁽¹¹⁵⁾

114. Pastor 109.1; Cf. 114.4.

115. Statements such as this make it abundantly clear that although the functions of Christ may be described in angelic terms and even in terms of Michael, as in Similitude 8, there is never any doubt about the superiority of Christ to the nature of the angels.

This is further qualified by saying that mere possession of the name is not sufficient; one must also receive clothing from the virgins who are the powers of the Son of God, and the garments are the names of the virgins, which the Son himself bears (90.2f.). Entry to the tower, then, is impossible except through Christ, and this building in which Christ plays such a central role is interpreted in terms of salvation history. Hermas asks who the stones are that came from the deep, and is told: 'The first ones, the ten that were placed in the foundation, are the first generation, and the twenty-five are the second generation of righteous men, and the thirty-five are the prophets of God and his helpers, and the forty are the apostles and teachers of the proclamation of the Son of God' (92.4). Here the salvation history is obvious. Although the prophets and righteous bore the spirits, this is not sufficient for their immediate location in the tower, 'they needed to come up through the water in order to be made alive, . . . so even those who had fallen asleep received the seal of the Son of God and entered into the kingdom of God' (93.2f.). This seal of the Son of God was given to those who had fallen asleep by the apostles and teachers.⁽¹¹⁶⁾ Christ is the centre of the salvation

115.(contd.) On the question of an Angel-Christology in Hermas see esp. J. Barbel, Christos Angelos. Die Anschauung von Christus als Bote und Engel in der gelehrten und volkstümlichen Literatur des christlichen Altertums (Bonn, 1941; = Theophaneia 3), pp. 47 - 50 (on the glorious angel), 196 - 98 (on the group of 7 angels), 230 - 33 (on Michael). The comment

history precisely because all that are saved are saved through him.

The conclusion of the construction of the tower is the unity of the tower with its foundation: 'That is why you see that the tower has become a monolith (*μονολίθου*) with the rock. So also those who believe in the Lord through his Son and dress themselves in these spirits will become one spirit, one body, and one colour for their garments' (90.5). In view of the complex nature of the work, it is perhaps wrong to set alongside this other aspects of the eschatological hope. In the fifth Similitude Hermas is urged to purity of both flesh and spirit (60.1ff.). Flesh is not evil, but is the dwelling place of the Spirit, as a result of which the flesh itself will receive its reward (59.7). Flesh and Spirit belong

115.(contd.) of Grillmeier is judicious: 'Prime concern is with the interpretation not of the nature, but of the mission of Christ. Judaistically-conditioned christology is predominantly functional, not ontological' (Grillmeier, *op. cit.*, pp. 55).

116. The curious feature of this is that it is the apostles who descend to Hades to proclaim the gospel and deliver the seal (i.e. baptism). In other literature it is Christ who descends (Gospel of Peter 41f.: proclamation but not specifically descent; Jeremiah Apocryphon cited by Justin, Dial. 72.4, and Irenaeus, adv.haer. III xx 4; IV xxii 1; xxxiii 1; V xxxi 1; Dem. 78: descent and deliverance as well as proclamation; Ignatius of Antioch, Magn. 9.2: deliverance but no proclamation). The reason for the difference is probably that the apostles were given the commission of baptising all men, and therefore they

together, and if one is defiled the other is defiled as well (60.4). The hope of the flesh, then is linked with the indwelling of the divine Spirit (60.1), and this is closely bound up with the Christology expressed in this Similitude: 'The pre-existent holy Spirit, which created all creation, God caused to dwell in that flesh which he wished. So this flesh, in which the Holy Spirit dwelled, served the Spirit well, living in reverence and purity, and did not defile the Spirit in any way. So because it conducted itself appropriately and purely and worked with the Spirit and collaborated in every deed, acting with strength and courage, he chose it as partner with the holy Spirit, for the conduct of this flesh pleased God because it was not defiled while it possessed the holy Spirit on earth. So he took the Son as a counsellor, and the glorious angels, that this flesh also, after it served the Spirit blamelessly, should have some place to dwell and not seem to have lost the reward of its servitude. For all flesh in which the holy Spirit has dwelled, when found undefiled and spotless, will receive a reward'.⁽¹¹⁷⁾ The perfect submission of the flesh to the Spirit in Christ makes it possible for his followers to show a like

116.(contd.) must administer baptism to the righteous of the Old Testament (Cf. Ep. Apost. 26f., however, where Christ himself administers baptism). See Daniélou, op. cit., pp. 237ff, Reicke, op. cit., Bieder, op. cit. See also nn. 63 above, ch.4, n.140 below and pp. 677f.

117. Pastor 59. 5 - 7. Cf. Pastor 28.

submission and win a similar reward. This Christology in similitude 5 (118) provides a very clear and direct link

118. This is the second of two explanations of the parable of Similitude 5. In the parable itself there is a clear adoptionism, in that the servant (presumably Christ) as a result of his work of supererogation is made joint heir with the son (but who is this son?). In the first explanation (Pastor 58), the servant is already the Son prior to his adoption, thus softening the adoptionism. In the second explanation, the servant is the flesh that is 'adopted' by the pre-existent Spirit, which is even further from the adoptionism of the parable itself. The Christology of Similitude 5 as a whole is extremely confused and confusing, and we do not propose to attempt a solution here, for which see, e.g. Grillmeier, op. cit., pp. 63 - 66, whose interpretation is given above; Cf. Lebreton, op. cit., pp. 357 - 76. Giet, op. cit., pp. 215 - 24, sees the clue to the solution of the confusion in the meaning of the term 'Son'. In the parable the servant is simply one who has kept the commandments exceptionally well; in the first comments the Son = the Spirit at work in the saints; and only in the second series of comments is there a reference to the Incarnation under the form of adoptionism, and then it is not strictly a πνεῦμα - σὰρξ Christology, but a πνεῦμα - man Christology, for σὰρξ refers to the whole man. Behind this adoptionism and the Spirit seen as Son of God lies the strong monotheism of Pastor 26.1. Cf. id. art. cit., in Aspects du Judéo-Christianisme, esp. pp. 106 - 111. Our concern here is with the πνεῦμα - σὰρξ Christology and the possible link it provides between Christology, redemption and salvation history. The origin of this christology appears to lie in the doctrine of

between Christ and the redemption of man, and also the destiny of the flesh.

In Similitude 9 the righteous of the Old Testament were 'the first who bore these spirits' (92.6), i.e. the virgins whose names the Son himself bears (90.3); and 'those who believe in the Lord through his Son and dress themselves in these spirits will become one spirit, one body, and one colour for their garments' (90.5). There is a link here between the Old Testament, Christ and the Church, a faint parallel with the salvation history discussed above. (119)

118.(contd.) the two spirits found in Essenism, e.g. in the Dead Sea Scrolls (See Daniélou, op. cit., pp. 141 - 45. Cf. Liébaert, op. cit., pp. 51f. who sees the origin in the concept of Wisdom. Cf. also Lawson, Studies in the Apostolic Fathers, pp. 250 - 53, who sees in the passage a reference not to Christology but to the indwelling of the Spirit in the believer). The holy Spirit of the two-spirit doctrine is identified with the power of God among men, pre-eminently present in Christ (See H. Berkhof, The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, London, 1965, pp. 17ff. and Snyder, op. cit., p. 108).

119. The relationship between the two is strictly in parallel and there is no grounds for a synthesis of similitudes 5 and 9 to produce a single line running via the Spirit, from the Old Testament, through Christ to the Church and the redemption of the flesh in the consummation. In Similitude 9 the spirits have no role in the Christology as such and are not to be identified with the Spirit who spoke to Hermas

To speak of Christocentric salvation history in the Shepherd of Hermas would be to give the mistaken impression that this is a vital point of the theology of the work. There are few indications of an interest in the unfolding of salvation history. Christ is of central importance but not so much as the centre of history, but as the perfect bearer of the Spirit and as the foundation of the Church. In the context of salvation history Christ has a central role, for no-one can enter the kingdom of God except through him; he is the portico by which one enters into the tower, he is old and new, he is the support for all creation and the means of approach to God, even for the righteous of the Old Testament. Nevertheless, the real concern of the author is the Church, the quality of its life and the need for repentance.

119.(contd.) in the form of the Church and is designated the Son of God in the same Similitude (78.1). Also, whereas in Similitude 5 the Spirit is associated with the flesh, the spirits in Similitude 9 are identified with the virtues (ch. 92), and flesh is mentioned only in connection with Hermas's inability to understand (78.2). There is, then, in Hermas a clear distinction between the spirits and the Holy Spirit (Cf. 43.5 - 10; and see Daniélou, *op. cit.*, pp. 142f.).

CHAPTER FOUR

THE APOCRYPHAL LITERATURE

A considerable proportion of the extant apocryphal literature is historical, in the sense that it purports to give an account of the events associated with the life of Jesus and the Apostles. Of history in the sense of salvation history there is very little; history and the purposes of God in history are not generally raised to the level of theological principles.⁽¹⁾ Nevertheless, some works do demand our attention. We do not propose to list here all the apocryphal literature available and justify its discussion or omission in the study that follows; only the works that have been found to be of importance for the main theme will be examined. Even so, some of the works merit only a few brief comments. Those that require fuller discussion are: Epistula Apostolorum, The basic writing underlying the Pseudo-Clementines, The Acts of Paul with particular reference to 3 Corinthians and the sermon of Paul in section 10, and The Ascension of Isaiah. These works will be discussed first and then the other works of minor importance.

1. The comments of Schneemelcher (in NTA II, p. 173) about the understanding of history in the apocryphal Acts are apposite here. e.g., 'In fine, one may say that the difference between the apocryphal and the canonical Acts appears in the fact that the interest of the apocryphal Acts depends upon the personal fortunes and deeds of the Apostles, and not on the history of the Church as a new period in the divinely appointed history of salvation'.

I EPISTULA APOSTOLORUM

The major part of this work from the middle of the second Century AD⁽²⁾ consists of a series of revelations made by the risen Lord to his Apostles. These revelations are preceded by a summary account of the work of creation and revelation in the Old Testament and the Incarnation and ministry of Christ (chh. 1 - 8), leading up to the resurrection (chh. 9 - 12) and the teaching then given to the Apostles. The work ends with the Ascension (ch.51). From a theological point of view, the orientation of the

2. On matters of general introduction, see, e.g.,
 H. Duensing, in NTA I, pp. 189 - 91, F.L. Cross, The Early Christian Fathers, pp. 85f., Daniélou, Theology of Jewish Christianity, pp. 27f., Carl Schmidt in Gespräche Jesu mit seinen Jüngern nach der Auferstehung. Ein katholisch-apostolisches Sendschreiben des 2. Jahrhunderts, edited by Carl Schmidt, "Übersetzung des äthiopischen Textes von I. Wajnberg (Leipzig, 1919; = TU 43), esp. pp. 361 - 402, and, most recently, M. Hornschuh, Studien zur Epistula Apostolorum (Berlin, 1965; = Patristische Texte und Studien 5), esp. pp. 1 - 8, 99 - 119, who, against the common opinion stemming from Schmidt that the work is to be dated c. 160 - 170 AD and is from Asia Minor, defends an early date (c. 120 AD), and regards the place of origin as Egypt. The translation used is that in NTA I, pp. 191 - 227, with constant reference to the edition of the Coptic by Schmidt and the translations of the Ethiopic by Wajnberg (in Schmidt) and L. Guerrier, in Le Testament en Galilée de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ, edited by L. Guerrier, (Paris, 1913; = Patrologia Orientalis IX/3). References are to the paragraphs as given in Duensing (NTA I).

work is governed by an attack on the Gnosticism of Simon and Cerinthus,⁽³⁾ and is itself 'a work typical of orthodox Jewish Christian gnosis'.⁽⁴⁾

As already indicated in the previous paragraph, the revelations given by Christ are preceded by an account of the events of salvation leading up to the discourses that followed the resurrection. The work opens with an appeal to orthodoxy of belief and a statement of the authority of the Apostles in regard to what they had proclaimed about Christ and how they had indeed 'heard and felt him after he had risen from the dead' and how he had revealed things to them (ch.12). There follows a confessional declaration:

We know this: our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ (is) God, Son of God who was sent from God, and ruler of the entire world, the maker and creator of what 'is named with every name' (Eph. 1.21), who is over all authority (as) 'Lord of lords and King of kings' (I Tim. 6.15; Rev. 17.14; 19.16), the ruler of the rulers, the heavenly one who is over the Cherubim and Seraphim and sits at the right hand of the throne of the Father, who by his word commanded the heavens and built the earth . . . (There follows a section on the creative and providential work of the Father); who has created man according to his image and likeness; who spoke in parables through the patriarchs and prophets and in truth through him whom the apostles declared and the disciples touched. And God, the Lord, the Son of God - We believe that 'the word', which 'became flesh' (Jn 1.14) through the holy virgin Mary, was carried

3. Ep.Apost. 1, 7. Cf. 'Der Zweck der Epistula ist, kurz gesagt, die Abwehr des Einbruchs der doketischen und antiapokalyptischen Gnosis' (Hornschuh, op. cit., p. 7).

(conceived) in her womb by the Holy Spirit, and was born not by the lust of the flesh but by the will of God, and was wrapped (in swaddling clothes) and made known at Bethlehem; and that he was reared and grew up, as we saw (ch. 3).

There is some lack of precision here between the roles of Christ and the Father.⁽⁵⁾ The opening phrases which assert the essential divinity and lordship of Christ include a reference to his role in creation. Later it is the Father who not only has the dominant role in creation but is the one who spoke through the prophets in parables and through the incarnate Christ in truth. This lack of precision should not be over-emphasised for the work has no pretensions to being a theological dissertation.⁽⁶⁾ In the light

4. Daniélou, op. cit., p. 27. The question of the exact nature of the work will be discussed in a little detail in a later note (See note 7 below).
5. The lack of precision is in part due to the Ethiopic text, in which it is not clear whether some statements refer to the Father or the Son. This is reflected in the German translation (Schmidt, Gespräche Jesu, p. 27). In spite of this, Schmidt has no hesitation in ascribing a major role in creation to the Son on the basis of this section (ibid., pp. 265 - 73). It is the Logos who is active in creation and revelation. The single reference to the Word (or, word, see below, p.197) by which God the Father commanded creation scarcely allows the construction of a Logos-doctrine. Cf. the review of Schmidt's work by G. Bardy, in Revue Biblique, 30 (1921), pp. 110 - 34, esp. pp. 119f. See also Hornschuh, op. cit., pp. 30 - 39, who shows that the Logos doctrine of the Epistula Apostolorum is not dependent on Justin (as Schmidt maintained), but reflects an older tradition.

of the acknowledged purpose of the work to attack the teachings of Simon and Cerinthus, the emphatic assertion of the divinity of Christ and of the reality of the Incarnation take on a clear significance; any gnosticising division of the divine and human in Jesus Christ is to be avoided. At the same time, the emphasis on the creative and providential role of the Father is a denial of the Gnostic denigration of the material universe. In the association of creation, patriarchs, prophets and incarnation there is an historical sweep that suggests salvation history, but in fact the author's attention is fixed not on the unfolding of the divine history of salvation as a counter to the Gnostic indifference to history, but on the unity of God.⁽⁷⁾

6. A point admitted by Schmidt, Gespräche Jesu, pp. 258f.
7. Although the work sets out to attack Gnostic teachings, there are certain elements in the work itself that have an apparent gnostic flavour, and the closest literary parallels to the work are to be found in some of the Gnostic writings, notably the Pistis Sophia. G. Bardy noted these similarities (in his review of Schmidt's Gespräche Jesu). He points out, for example, that in its situation (a post-resurrection discourse) the work resembles other Gnostic works; use is made of the Infancy Gospel of Thomas (cf. 6.2f., 14.2) or its tradition in the account of Jesus at school (Ep.Apost. 4); the apostle John, the 'favourite' apostle of the Gnostics, has the chief position in the Epistula Apostolorum (ch. 2); the theme of the descent and ascent of Christ features in Gnostic works; redemption is not by the death of Christ but by acceptance of his teaching. From these and other minor points Bardy concluded that the work, if not strictly gnostic, at

The part played by Christ in creation, then is by no means clear; the emphasis of the opening lines of the paragraph quoted above lies more on the present lordship of Christ than on his creative role. The Father by his word commanded the heavens. Here, 'the word' is no more than the Father's word of command,⁽⁸⁾ and yet a little

- 7.(contd.) least exhibited gnostic tendencies to a sufficient extent to deny the description of it as 'ein katholisch-apostolisches Sendschreiben' in Schmidt's sub-title. If Bardy succeeds in showing that the work is not strictly 'orthodox', he fails to show that the themes that the work shares with some of the Gnostic literature are used in the Epistula Apostolorum in a Gnostic manner. Schmidt had himself already considered this, particularly in relation to the themes of the descent of Christ through the seven heavens (Gespräche Jesu, pp. 276 - 88) and of the Incarnation itself (ibid., pp. 288 - 94). The background, e.g. of the descent-theme is Jewish, as its association with the Ascension of Isaiah plainly shows (see below pp.175ff.). Bardy misses this Jewish or Jewish-Christian character and has, moreover, too restricted a view of orthodoxy. The judgement of Daniélou is nearest the mark; it is 'a work typical of orthodox Jewish Christian gnosis', and cf. 'Soweit wir bis jetzt sehen, hat der Verfasser seine Christologie aus jüdischem und gnostischem Material zusammengesetzt' (Hornschuh, op. cit., p. 39), and on Jewish elements, ibid., pp. 67 - 80.
8. Schmidt, (Gespräche Jesu, pp. 271f.) regards this as the Logos, and more precisely as 'the Logos of the Apologists' (ibid., p. 271), but this, as we have indicated above (note 5), is to be too precise.

later the author asserts that 'the word became flesh', where, as in St John whom he quotes, 'the word' is more than simply the Father's command. In the passage above, too, the Old Testament revelation is the work of the Father; in the discourses of the risen Christ to the Apostles, however, Christ himself says: 'All that was said by the prophets was thus performed and has taken place and is completed in me, for I spoke in (or, by) them' (ch. 19). The Coptic version is even more explicit: 'But if all the words that were spoken by the prophets are fulfilled in me - for I was in them - . . .' The fact that Christ appears to have some role both in creation and in the Old Testament revelation does not mean that that role is understood in terms of salvation history. Of history as the unfolding of the divine purpose there is no trace. (9)

In spite of the references to the prophets, the coming of Christ is not historically orientated as the culmination of the divine plan in history, but is described as a descent and ascent: 'While I was coming from the

9. Schmidt sees signs of 'das Prinzip der Heilsoffenbarung innerhalb der geschichtlichen Entwicklung der Menschheit' (Gespräche Jesu, p. 272), but this is entirely dependent on his view that it is the Logos who has been active in creation and revelation. On account of the imprecise nature of the original text, it is somewhat hazardous to build on that an idea not only of the Logos's role in creation and revelation, but also the idea that this indicates an awareness of man's historical development.

Father of all, passing by the heavens, wherein I put on the wisdom of the Father and by his power clothed myself in his power, I was in the heavens. And passing by the angels and archangels in their form and as one of them, I passed by the orders, dominions, and princes, possessing the measure of the wisdom of the Father who sent me. And the arch-angels Michael and Gabriel, Raphael and Uriel followed me until the fifth firmament of heaven, while I appeared as one of them . . . For I became all in all with them, that I, having . . . (lacuna) . . . the will of the mercy of the Father and perfected the glory of him who sent me, might return to him.⁽¹⁰⁾ By means of this descent and ascent, Christ accomplishes 'the will of the mercy of the Father' (or, according to the Coptic, 'the plan (οἰκονομία) of the Father'),⁽¹¹⁾ but the will or plan is not concerned directly with history as the unfolding of God's purposes.⁽¹²⁾

The Incarnation also takes place by the will of God and not by the lust of the flesh (ch. 3). In the Incarnation we find again that imprecision that we have

10. Ep.Apost. 13; the Coptic differs in some details.

The theme of the descent and ascent of Christ will be met again in the Ascension of Isaiah (q.v.).

11. Neither the Ethiopic nor Coptic has a verb to describe what Christ does to the will or plan of God, but presumably some such idea as 'accomplishes' was intended. οἰκονομία here does not necessarily presuppose a time-line.

12. On the theme of the descent see Schmidt (Gespräche Jesu, pp. 281ff. with reference to the Gnostic elements in the theme) and cf. Daniélou, op. cit., pp. 206 - 14.

already noted. The word is carried (conceived) in the womb of the virgin Mary by the Holy Spirit (ch. 3). But in the discourses Christ is the agent in his own Incarnation;⁽¹³⁾ he adopts the form of Gabriel for the annunciation to Mary, 'and I, the Word, went into her and became flesh; and I myself was servant for myself, and in the form of the image of an angel.'⁽¹⁴⁾ The form of the work as discourses by the risen Christ leads to some statements by Christ about the Incarnation that in isolation have a docetic tone to them. Thus Christ says that he has 'put on flesh',⁽¹⁵⁾ but here it must be remembered that it is the risen Christ who speaks, and that even though the divinity of Christ is strongly emphasised,⁽¹⁶⁾ it is also said that he 'became flesh',⁽¹⁷⁾ and it is clearly asserted that he was born, died and buried and raised by his Father.⁽¹⁸⁾ The resurrection likewise is 'in the flesh'.⁽¹⁹⁾

13. Schmidt, Gespräche Jesu, pp. 288 - 94, deals fully with the Gnostic and 'orthodox' parallels to the idea that Christ is the agent of his own Incarnation. Hornschuh (op. cit., pp. 41ff.) considers that behind this idea lies Egyptian mythology that has been interpreted with the help of Hellenistic Hermes-mysticism.
14. Ep.Apost. 14; Coptic differs slightly.
15. Ep.Apost. 19, 21.
16. Schmidt, Gespräche Jesu, pp. 265f. speaks of a 'theologia Christi'. Cf. 'the unity of the Son and the Father is so strongly emphasized that one could justifiably speak of identity' (Duensing, NTA I, p. 190).
17. Ep.Apost. 3, 14, 39.
18. Ep.Apost. 19, 39.

Redemption is closely connected with the Incarnation in the following passage: 'And for this cause have I perfected all mercy: without being begotten I was born (or, begotten) of man, and without having flesh I put on flesh and grew up, that (I might regenerate) you who were begotten in the flesh, and in regeneration you obtain the resurrection in your flesh, a garment that will not pass away, with all who hope and believe in him who sent me; for my Father has found pleasure in you; and to whoever I will I give the hope of the kingdom.'⁽²⁰⁾ Thus the coming of Christ in the flesh leads to the regeneration of man in the flesh. The Incarnation in a real sense is redemption, and from this springs the emphasis that the author places on the reality of Christ's flesh.⁽²¹⁾ Redemption, however, is not simply salvation of the flesh; as Christ himself says: 'Truly I say to you that I have received all power from my Father that I may bring back those in darkness into light and those in corruptibility into incorruptibility and those in error into righteousness and those in death into life, and that those in

19. Ep.Apost. 12. Cf. 'Als erbitterter Gegner jeder doketischen Christologie heftet sich sein Glaube an das Bild des geschichtlichen Christus, wie es in den Evangelien und im Kerygma vorliegt' (Schmidt, Gespräche Jesu, p. 303, and see pp. 294 - 303).
20. Ep.Apost. 21; Coptic differs slightly and lacks part of the text.
21. Cf. 'In der Menschwerdung sieht unser Verfasser die Vollendung des Heilsplanes Gottes' (Schmidt, Gespräche Jesu, p. 313). This theme, as Schmidt notes, plays an important role in Irenaeus, as we shall see.

captivity may be loosed, as what is impossible on the part of men is possible on the part of the Father, I am the hope of the hopeless, the helper of those who have no helper, the treasure of those in need, the physician of the sick, the resurrection of the dead.⁽²²⁾ Redemption is a shift from darkness, corruptibility, error, death and captivity, to light, incorruptibility, righteousness, life and freedom. Although everyman has the power to choose between good and evil, and Adam himself chose the light (ch. 39), nevertheless, it is on obedience to the commandments of Christ that life and death are decided.⁽²³⁾ Redemption, then, is brought by Christ, through his incarnation and teaching. Yet only in the Incarnation is redemption related to the acts of God in history; the death of Jesus is without saving significance.⁽²⁴⁾

So also with regard to the descent of Christ to Hades in order to preach and administer baptism to the patriarchs and prophets (ch. 27); it is not motivated by any concern to integrate the whole of history into a coherent pattern of salvation history even though it serves to underline

22. Ep.Apost. 21; Coptic lacks all but the beginning of this.

23. 'Now therefore see that each one is able to live as well as to die. And whoever does my commandment and keeps it will be a son of the light, i.e. of my Father' (Ep.Apost. 39; Coptic differs slightly).

24. See esp. Hornschuh, op. cit., pp. 58 - 60.

the completeness of Christ's mission. There is here the Jewish-Christian concern for the fate of the righteous of the Old Testament; to them as well has Christ proclaimed the rest ($\alpha\nu\alpha\pi\alpha\nu\theta\iota\varsigma$) in heaven, he has granted also forgiveness of sins and administered baptism, the prerequisite of entry into the kingdom of heaven. So the apostles give thanks: 'O Lord, in every respect you have made us rejoice and have given us rest; for in faithfulness and truthfulness you have preached to our fathers and to the prophets, and even so to us and to every man.' (25) The emphasis lies not on the historical line but on the completeness of Christ's work. (26)

Continuity between the prophets of the Old Testament and the Church is stated, but not historical development. Thus the Apostles are told of the conversion of Paul, and are reminded that they must teach him what they had learned from Scriptures (that the prophets had spoken about Christ) and had seen fulfilled in Christ, 'then he will be for the salvation of the Gentiles' (ch. 31). The line runs from the prophets through Christ to the preaching to the Gentiles (ch. 30). The content of the teaching is that Christ is the word of the Father and that the Father is in him (ch. 31). The historical line is there, but the idea is not developed at all.

25. Ep. Apost. 28; Coptic differs slightly.

26. See further Schmidt's long Excursus, 'Der Descensus ad inferos in der alten Kirche' (Gespräche Jesu, pp. 453 - 576), and Daniélou, *op. cit.*, pp. 233 - 48.

The author of the Epistula Apostolorum is also aware of the goal towards which salvation is moving. Christ says: 'I will come as the sun which bursts forth; thus will I, shining seven times brighter than it in glory, while I am carried on the wings of the clouds in splendour with my cross going on before me, come to the earth to judge the living and the dead' (ch. 16). What is more, the date is set, 150 years (Coptic: 120th part) after the resurrection, between Pentecost and Passover (ch. 17) and the splendour of the second coming will contrast with the lowliness of the first. In spite of the fact that the judgement that accompanies the second coming takes place on earth there is no real awareness of this as the conclusion of salvation history. The Apostles are also promised that they will see the perfection of the glory of the Son in the Father, the Son who is 'fully the right hand of the Father' and 'in him who accomplishes (i.e. the Father; see the Coptic)' (ch. 19), but again the vision is not related to salvation history. As the Father raised Christ from the dead, so the Apostles too will arise (Ethiopic adds, 'in the flesh') and will ascend to the place prepared for them by the Father (ch. 21). In this eventual movement to the place of rest prepared by the Father the righteous of the Old Testament will share (ch. 28). The resurrection of the flesh too is emphatically, even polemically, affirmed.⁽²⁷⁾ This is

27. Ep. Apost. 22ff. See further, Schmidt, Gespräche Jesu, pp. 346 - 51, Hornschuh, op. cit., pp. 64 - 66.

connected with the idea we have already seen in relation to the Incarnation, that Christ comes in the flesh to bring regeneration in the flesh. The transition from the resurrection of the Apostles to the Incarnation is by the following phrase in the Coptic version: 'And thus will I complete all arrangements (for salvation) (οἰκονομίαι). (28) The direct link between the Incarnation, the resurrection of Christ in the flesh and the resurrection of the Apostles is made very clearly; the 'arrangements' are even stages of salvation history, but the stages succeed each other without the succession being noted as an essential theological fact.

There is in the Epistula Apostolorum an awareness of the movement of events from creation, through patriarchs and prophets to Christ, the Church and the consummation, and of the idea that all things come under the Father's providential rule, and in this movement Christ plays a central role, but it would be wrong to regard this in any way as evidence of a concern in the work for salvation history. History and the historical are important in the Incarnation, but there is no interest in the unfolding of history as an on-going process in which the divine purpose is worked out in successive events. The movement that can be discerned is incidental to the significance of the events that succeed each other.

28. Ep. Apost. 21. Ethiopic reads: 'And for this cause I have I perfected all mercy'.

II PSEUDO-CLEMENTINES

The Pseudo-Clementine romance exists in two recensions, the Homilies and Recognitions,⁽²⁹⁾ the exact relationship of which to each other is difficult to determine. Behind these two recensions there appears to lie a basic writing that originated in Syria in the first half of the third Century,⁽³⁰⁾ but while it is agreed that the Homilies are a development of this basic writing, there is disagreement as to whether the Recognitions represent another development of the basic writing independent of the Homilies, or a development of both the basic writing and the Homilies.⁽³¹⁾

29. The following editions have been used: Die Pseudoklementinen I Homilien, edited by B. Rehm (Berlin, 1953; = GCS 42); Die Pseudoklementinen II Rekognitionen in Rufins Übersetzung, edited by B. Rehm (Berlin, 1965; = GCS 51). The translations of the Homilies and the Recognitions by T. Smith; P. Peterson and J. Donaldson and T. Smith respectively in ANCL (vols. 3 and 17) have been consulted but not adhered to.
30. This much is agreed by the following: G. Strecker, Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudoklementinen (Berlin, 1958; = TU 70), pp. 255 - 67; id. in NTA II, pp. 110f.; J. Irmscher, in NTA II, p. 533; B. Rehm, 'Zur Entstehung der pseudoclementinischen Schriften', in ZNTW, 37(1938), p. 156; J. Daniélou, op. cit., p. 59; H.J. Schoeps, Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums (Tübingen, 1949), pp. 38f.; id. 'Die Pseudoklementinen und das Urchristentum', in ZRGG, 10(1958), p. 4; Cf. F.L. Cross, The Early Christian Fathers, p. 99.
31. Rehm (art. cit., pp. 161ff.), followed by Irmscher (NTA II, p. 534), maintains the dependence of the Recognitions on both the basic writing and the Homilies. Strecker

The justification for including even the basic writing in a discussion of the second Century lies in the fact that this writing itself contains material that stems from earlier traditions.⁽³²⁾ The most important of these is the material known as the Kerygmata Petrou, which, combined with other documents, makes up the Journeys of Peter mentioned by Epiphanius and quoted by Origen that is, in the main, the basic, Pseudo-Clementine writing.⁽³³⁾ The exact delimitation of the source material of the basic writing is not at all easy, especially if the 'list of contents' of Peter's preaching,⁽³⁴⁾ is regarded as a

31.(contd.) rejects this (TU 70, pp. 35 - 38, cf. NTA II, p. 105), and maintains that the two recensions are independent. Schoeps (op. cit., pp. 39f., art. cit., p. 4) also considers them independent. Strecker (op. cit., pp. 1 - 34) gives an extensive survey of studies on the Pseudo-Clementines.

32. See e.g. the work of Strecker, but cf. the cautionary remarks of Schoeps about the difficulties involved in establishing with any degree of certainty the extent and character of sources underlying the basic writing which must itself be reconstructed from the two recensions available. Major distinctions are not too difficult, but detailed precision is impossible. Schoeps, ZRGG, 10 (1958), pp. 4f.; id., ZRGG, 11(1959), pp. 72 - 77 (a review of Strecker's work).

33. See e.g. Daniélou, op. cit., pp. 59f.; Irmischer, NTA II, p. 533; Strecker, op. cit., pp. 35 - 96, 137 - 254; Schoeps, op. cit., 37 - 61.

34. Rec. III 75.

literary fiction.⁽³⁵⁾ Beyond the fact of establishing the probability that the material to be discussed derives from the traditional strata of the basic writing the literary problems of the Pseudo-Clementines do not concern us here. From the point of view of Christocentric salvation history in fact there are only two themes that merit discussion: the concept of the 'true prophet' and the section, Recognitions I 27 - 71, in which salvation history plays an important part.

The figure of the true prophet forms the major theme of the first book of the Kerygmata Petrou, if one accepts the List of Contents in Rec. III 75,⁽³⁶⁾ and even if this is not accepted as a true indication of the contents of the Kerygmata Petrou the concept of the true prophet is

35. Rehm (art. cit., p. 146) followed by Strecker (op. cit., p. 31), regards it as a fiction. Schoeps (op. cit., pp. 45f.) is unconvinced, mainly on the ground that the list refers to themes that are scattered in both Recognitions and Homilies, and in some cases no longer extant at all, which would make the section a most extraordinary fiction. Daniélou likewise (op. cit., p. 60) accepts the list as basically accurate. Although Strecker rejects the list, he is still able to reconstruct the Kerygmata Petrou, but he must rely more on other literary and theological criteria.
36. Schoeps offers a list of the passages in the Homilies and Recognitions that in his opinion stem from the first book of the Kerygmata Petrou (op. cit., pp. 50f.) - Hom. I 18 - 20; Rec. I 15 - 17; 32 - 42 (excerpts); 46 - 53; Hom. II 6 - 12; Hom. III 17 - 28; Rec. IV 2 - 20; Hom. VIII 2 - 20; Hom. IX 2 - 23. Cf. the selection by Strecker in NTA II, pp. 111 - 27.

still to be associated with the preachings on terminological grounds and on the ground of content.⁽³⁷⁾ The principal section in which the concept is expressed is Hom. III 17 - 28. Although the expression, 'the true Prophet', occurs outside this passage, it is sometimes quite clear that the author of the basic writing has not only used sources but has taken over and himself used some of the concepts of the sources.⁽³⁸⁾ Our comments here, then, are restricted to Hom. III 17 - 28 and other passages that can be shown to belong to the Kerygmata Petrou.⁽³⁹⁾

37. See Strecker, op. cit., p. 145.

38. In Strecker's opinion, e.g. the appearance of the true prophet in the section Rec. I 32ff. represents an intrusion into another source (AJ II, on which see below, pp. 159 ff.) by the author of the basic writing. See Strecker, op. cit., pp. 223f.

39. It will already be apparent that the interpretation of the concept of the true prophet is to a large extent determined by the literary analysis of the contents of the Kerygmata Petrou. The major difference between the interpretations of the true prophet by Schoeps (op. cit., pp. 98 - 116) and Strecker (op. cit., pp. 145 - 53) stems from the fact that Schoeps includes in his material the references to the true prophet in the section Rec. I 32ff., a section which he regards as part of the Kerygmata Petrou (op. cit., p. 52), but which Strecker regards as a separate source (AJ II, op. cit., pp. 221 - 54). Since we shall be considering that section later, we have, in the main, followed Strecker's analysis of the true prophet, but shall indicate below (see p. 159) the main outlines of Schoeps's approach. Cf. also the study by W. Staerk in Die Erlösererwartung in den östlichen Religionen.

The true prophet is the one who, alone possessing the spirit, 'from the beginning of the world, changing his forms and his names (ἅμα τοῖς ὀνόμασιν μορφὰς ἀλλάσσων), runs through universal time (τὸν αἰῶνα τρέχει) until, anointed for his toils by the mercy of God, he comes to his own time (ὅτε ἰδίῳ χρόνῳ τυχῶν) and will have rest for ever (εἰς ἀεὶ ἔξει τὴν ἀνάπαυσιν).⁽⁴⁰⁾

The suggestion of the movement of time towards a goal is unmistakable; it begins with the creation and reaches its goal in the Incarnation.⁽⁴¹⁾ In creation, it is Adam who

39.(contd.) Untersuchungen zu den Ausdrucksformen der biblischen Christologie (Soter II) (Stuttgart, 1938), pp. 98 - 112, whose approach more closely resembles that of Schoeps than that of Strecker, in that he makes no attempt to distinguish detailed literary strands. According to Staerk, 'in der Gestalt des ἀληθῆς προφήτης geht die Offenbarung Gottes als die einzige zuverlässige Erkenntnisquelle durch die Geschichte der Menschheit' (ibid., p. 99).

40. Hom. III 20.2.

41. Although there is no direct connection, we may compare with this statement the passage from the Gospel of the Hebrews: 'And it came to pass when the Lord was come up out of the water, the whole fount of the Holy Spirit descended upon him and rested upon him and said to him: "My Son, in all the prophets was I waiting for thee that thou shouldest come and I might rest in thee. For thou art my rest; thou art my first-begotten Son that reignest for ever"' (Jerome, Comm. on Is. IV on Is. 11.2 = NTA I, pp. 163F.). Both passages share the ideas of expectation and of rest, but there the similarities end.

is the true prophet. The sign of true prophecy is knowledge of the future,⁽⁴²⁾ and Adam shows that he has such knowledge in his naming of the beasts and Abel, since 'Abel' means 'grief'.⁽⁴³⁾ The foreknowledge which demonstrates that Adam is the true prophet stems from the fact that Adam possessed 'the great and holy Spirit of God's foreknowledge (τὸ μέγα καὶ ἅγιον τῆς προγνώσεως αὐτοῦ πνεῦμα)'.⁽⁴⁴⁾ In this, Adam differs from the rest of mankind who are 'begotten of impure seed (ἐκ μυσαρᾶς σταγόνας γεννηθέντι)'.⁽⁴⁵⁾ Like the rest of mankind Adam has the image of God,⁽⁴⁶⁾ which confers lordship over the world,⁽⁴⁷⁾ but where other men have the likeness (ὁμοιότης),⁽⁴⁸⁾ Adam has the divine Spirit (πνεῦμα θεῶν).⁽⁴⁹⁾ Adam, then, made by the hands of God⁽⁵⁰⁾ and possessing the Spirit, is the true prophet and does not sin (Sin originates with the female principle, who forms a kind of negative counter-part to the true prophet).⁽⁵¹⁾ The foreknowledge that indicates that Adam was a prophet is bound up with anointing, and even if the Genesis-account says nothing about Adam's being anointed, 'if the first man prophesied, it is certain that he was anointed too.'⁽⁵²⁾

42. Hom. III 11; Rec. I 47. 43. Hom. III 26.1f.

44. Hom. III 17.1.

45. Hom. III 17.1.

46. Hom. III 17.2.

47. Hom. III 20.3.

47. Hom. III 20.3.

48. See Strecker, op. cit., pp. 205f.

49. Hom. III 17.3; 20.1.

50. Hom. III 17.1; 20.1.

51. Hom. III 22 - 25.

52. Rec. I 47.3.

The foreknowledge shown by Adam is shown also by Moses in indicating beforehand the sins of the people,⁽⁵³⁾ so he too resembles the true prophet who passes through universal time. The other major figure besides Adam, however, in connection with the true prophet is Christ.⁽⁵⁴⁾ Christ, too, is anointed with oil from the tree of life;⁽⁵⁵⁾ like Adam he is called father (πατήρ).⁽⁵⁶⁾ The true prophet comes to his own time in Christ. The idea of the true prophet traversing time is given a number of interpretations in the various stages of the construction of the Recognitions,⁽⁵⁷⁾ but the earliest strand, the one we are concerned with here, seems to have had in mind a succession of incarnations.⁽⁵⁸⁾ As we have seen, Moses is

53. Hom. III 44.1.

54. According to Hom. XVII 4.3 (cf. Rec. II 47.2) there are eight manifestations: Adam, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses and Jesus. Schoeps (op. cit., pp. 53, 105f.) includes this passage in the Kerygmata Petrou.

55. Rec. I 45.4f.

56. Hom. III 18.1f.

57. Strecker (op. cit., pp. 149f.), with a more restricted view than Schoeps as to the content of the Kerygmata Petrou, sees the variations as the work of different redactors.

58. So Strecker, op. cit., p. 150. Schoeps asks whether these are strictly re-incarnations of the true prophet, or simply bearers of the Spirit of revelation (op. cit., p. 106) and maintains that they are neither. 'The true prophet is the ideal Man realised according to the image of God, who is anointed with holy Spirit. According to Jewish-Christian theology he is embodied in Adam and Jesus, whereas he appears to Abraham and Moses only as

one of the figures included in this succession, but there is no thought here of a Moses-Christ parallel; Christ is not a second Moses,⁽⁵⁹⁾ for the true prophet is first encountered in Adam, and Moses is but one stage in the progression that reaches from Adam to Christ. The progression is a straight line that reaches from Adam to its fulfilment in Christ; the movement is in one direction only, and not in a circle.⁽⁶⁰⁾ Except insofar as Adam, Moses and Christ represent points in history the concept of the true prophet traversing universal time has no essential connection with history,⁽⁶¹⁾ and the redemption

58.(contd.) a revelation-figure (Offenbarungsgestalt), in order to reveal the fundamentals of the true religion.' (op. cit., pp. 106f.). He is 'die sukzessiv sich aufbauende Offenbarungsgestalt des präexistenten Menschen resp. der interna species des Menschen, welche älter ist als das wirkliche Geschöpf, denn als filius dei et initium omnium homo factus est (Rec. I 45.4)' (ibid., p. 107). Cf. Staerk (op. cit., pp. 106ff.) who sees Adam, Moses and Christ as incarnations of the true prophet, and other figures as simply receivers of manifestations. Again, the differences to some extent depend on the question of literary analysis.

59. But see below, the next paragraph.

60. See Strecker, op. cit., pp. 150f.

61. As Schoeps points out (op. cit., p. 104), there is a connection here between the Pseudo-Clementines and Irenaeus's doctrine of recapitulation (q.v.), but where in Irenaeus the historical element of the relationship between Adam and Christ is of the utmost importance, in the Pseudo-Clementines there is no interest in history as such.

that he brings is not understood as the historical events associated with the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ; rather it is the bringing of knowledge of the Law.⁽⁶²⁾ Adam taught an eternal law;⁽⁶³⁾ Moses delivered the Law,⁽⁶⁴⁾ but because of the false traditions of the Jews⁽⁶⁵⁾ the true prophet, Christ, must come and teach the truth.

The movement associated with the true prophet has, then, no immediate connection with salvation history. However, the author of the basic writing has taken over the concept and has included it in the account of salvation history that we are shortly to discuss. There the true prophet is not identified with any figure, but appears to Abraham and to Moses⁽⁶⁶⁾ to teach them. The true prophet here is not the one who passes through universal time from Adam to the time of Christ, but is the prophet promised by Moses.⁽⁶⁷⁾ Such an identification of these prophets is not difficult even though the underlying ideas are different (In the Recognitions here the dominant theme is the Moses-Christ typology). The identification is probably the work of the author of the basic writing

62. Hom. III 18.2f.

63. Hom. VIII 10.3.

64. Hom. III 47.1ff.

65. Hom. III 18f.; cf. Hom. II 38.

66. Rec. I 33.1; 34.4.

67. Rec. I 36.2; 39.1; 40.1; 56.2; 57.5.

of the Pseudo-Clementines.⁽⁶⁸⁾

The section, Rec. I 27 - 71, is bounded at the beginning by the introductory material of Peter to his teaching of which this following section is the content. The conclusion is determined by the shift of Peter to Caesarea and his encounter with Simon Magus. The section may form part of the Kerygmata Petrou.⁽⁶⁹⁾ That the

68. The position adopted in this paragraph is based on Strecker's analysis. A totally different conclusion is reached by Schoeps. For him the linking of the Adam-Christ theme with the Moses-Christ theme is not the work of the author of the basic writing, but goes back to the Kerygmata Petrou itself. The concept of the true prophet is not simply an Adam-Christ theme, but an Adam-Moses-Christ theme, in which Moses is also the true prophet (Schoeps, op. cit., pp. 110 - 16). The themes which Strecker contrasts, Adam-Christ and Moses-Christ, Schoeps combines. Behind this difference of opinion lies, as so often in the study of the Pseudo-Clementines, a difference of literary analysis. As we have already pointed out (n. 39), Schoeps includes as part of the Kerygmata Petrou material that Strecker regards as stemming from a separate source. The grounds for regarding it as a separate source are given in the following note.
69. Schoeps, as we have seen, simply considers this section as part of the Kerygmata Petrou. Strecker (op. cit., pp. 222f.) rejects this on the following grounds: (1) In Hom. VIII 5 - 7, which shows some characteristic traits of the Kerygmata Petrou (See Strecker, op. cit., pp. 164f.), Moses and Jesus are equated. In Rec. I 59.1 - 3, however, Jesus is superior to Moses. (2) In the Kerygmata Petrou the death of Jesus is without significance, indeed there is no reference to it; but

section represents a written source is indicated by the way in which it is interrupted by the insertion, Rec. I 44.3 - 53.4.⁽⁷⁰⁾ Even without this insertion, the remainder of the section is not a unity; the section Rec. I 27 - 32 was possibly an independent source,⁽⁷¹⁾ but

69. (contd.) there are several references to the death of Jesus in this passage (Rec. I 41.2f; 43.3; 59.7; and also Rec. I 49f.; 59; 69). (3) The teaching about the Female principle and about the syzygies that features prominently in the Kerygmata Petrou is absent from the present section. (4) Although some earlier scholars had noted the distinctive character of the section they had included it in the Kerygmata Petrou on the basis of the list of contents in Rec. III 75, which Strecker considers false (see above note 35). This evidence is of unequal value, the third point being the strongest. Nevertheless, the warnings of Schoeps noted earlier must be borne in mind. The source that Strecker is attempting to uncover is in a basic writing which is itself not extant. This source, which extends from I 33 - 71 with the exception of 44.3 - 53.4 (see following notes) is called by Strecker 'die AJ II-Quelle'. By this he wishes to indicate that behind this source, and behind the *Ἀναβαθμοὶ Ἰεκώπου* (= AJ I) mentioned by Epiphanius (Pan. 30.16.6 - 9), there is a common tradition (AJ).
70. The insertion is indicated not only by the change in subject-matter (to a discussion between Clement and Peter), but by the fact that the original theme returns with an almost identical sentence.
71. Strecker (op. cit., p. 221) argues that Rec. I 27 - 32 was originally independent: (1) In ch. 32 Abraham receives a revelation of an angel; in ch. 33 it is a visitation of the true prophet. (2) In ch. 33 the Persians are descended from Eliesdros; in ch. 30 they

will nevertheless be discussed here since it was clearly added at this point as a fitting prologue to, or even as part of, the salvation history from Abraham on. Only the first part of Rec. I 27 - 71 (i.e. 27 - 43) is directly connected with the account of salvation history, but the second part (44.1 - 2; 53.4 - 71), devoted to the dispute with the Jews that eventually ends in uproar, is connected with the first part in that the disobedience of Israel and their rejection of the prophet lays the foundation for the dispute between the Jews and the Church.

The section opens with an account of creation, culminating in the creation of man 'ob cuius causam omnia quae sunt, facta sunt, ministerio eius concessa et habitationis eius usibus data.'⁽⁷²⁾ The fall comes about in the eighth generation because righteous men, 'infecti pulchritudine mulierum', fell into immorality and this infected all men.⁽⁷³⁾ God destroyed the wicked but saved

71.(contd.) are associated with Nimrod. (3) The count of the generations stops at ch. 32, and the parallel with Acts 7.2ff. begins with ch. 33. The first point is meaningless since Strecker himself regards the mention of the true prophet in this section as the work of the author of the basic writing (see Strecker, op. cit., pp. 223f.). It is difficult to know what weight to give to the other points, and on the whole the evidence seems inconclusive.

72. Rec. I 28.4.

73. Req. I 29.1f. In the Kerygmata Petrou sin enters through the female principle (Hom. III 22ff.). Both accounts of the origin of sin depend on Genesis.

Noah in the ark. The account of the generations is continued down to the 21st generation, the time of Abraham, in which the whole world was again weighed down by various errors and ready for destruction, this time by fire. Abraham, on account of his friendship with God, gained from God that not all the world should be destroyed.⁽⁷⁴⁾ At the same time, Abraham, 'being an astrologer, was able to recognise the creator from the account and order of the stars, and understand that all things were governed by his providence.'⁽⁷⁵⁾ This knowledge is confirmed by an angel.⁽⁷⁶⁾ The author of the basic writing sees in this a manifestation of the true prophet, who teaches Abraham about the Divinity, the

73.(contd.) N.P. Williams (The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin. A Historical and Critical Study, London, 1929; = Bampton Lectures 1924) lists four theories of the origin of sin extant at the time of Jesus: (a) Sin was introduced into the world by the unnatural marriages between angels and women (Gen. 6. 1 - 4) (Williams regards this as the earliest explanation); (b) Sin stemmed from the transgression of Adam and Eve, seen either as (i) Adam's wilful transgression of God's command or as (ii) the result of Eve's pollution by the serpent; (c) According to the Rabbinical theology sin was an evil impulse implanted in each man individually; (d) Philo associates sin with finitude. According to this scheme the account in the Recognitions belongs to type (a), and that of the Homilies is a development of type (b)(ii) in which the role of the serpent has disappeared and the female principle is itself corrupt.

74. Rec. I 32.2

75. Rec. I 32.2; cf. Rec. I 28.1f.

76. Rec. I 32.4.

origin and end of the world, the immortality of the soul, the way of life pleasing to God, the resurrection of the dead and the future judgement.⁽⁷⁷⁾ The history of Israel is continued down to the descent into Egypt, the Exodus under Moses, the trek through the desert, the giving of the Law at Sinai, and the disobedience of the Israelites.⁽⁷⁸⁾ The particular understanding of salvation history in this section becomes apparent at this point; Moses leads the people of Israel in the desert for 40 years 'so that the innovation of a changed way of life might destroy the evils which had clung to them from long familiarity with the customs of the Egyptians.'⁽⁷⁹⁾ Nevertheless, Moses, realising how deeply ingrained were the bad habits, especially with reference to sacrifice, was compelled to permit some sacrifices, though only to God.⁽⁸⁰⁾ In this way half the evil would be removed, the other half being left to be corrected at another time by him of whom he himself (so. Moses) said: 'The Lord your God will raise up for you a prophet like me; you shall listen to him in accordance with everything he says to you. For, whoever does not hearken to that prophet, his soul shall be rooted out from his people.'⁽⁸¹⁾ The purpose of salvation history is the elimination of the bad practice of sacrificing, which the Israelites adopted from the Egyptians.

77. Rec. I 33.2.

78. Rec. I 33.3 - 35.6.

79. Rec. I 35.1; cf. Rec. I 35.6.

80. Rec. I 36.1.

81. Rec. I 36.2. Cf. Dt. 18.15, 19; Acts 3.22f.

Not only were the sacrifices permitted by Moses as a temporary measure, but the place of the sacrifices was given a temporary status as well. The Israelites were to learn that God desires mercy and not sacrifice and that the place of sacrifice is God's wisdom.⁽⁸²⁾ To remind them of all this, the temple was periodically destroyed. This truth was understood by very few, and the people in general became more and more impious.⁽⁸³⁾ The working out of salvation history begins to reach its fulfilment with John the Baptist. Baptism replaces sacrifice as a means of remission of sins.⁽⁸⁴⁾ 'Therefore, things having been pre-ordained in this way, he who was awaited comes, bearing signs and wonders, the indications by which he should be made manifest.'⁽⁸⁵⁾ He is rejected by Israel, but chose the twelve, who believed in him so that 'the multitude might believe that this is he who Moses foretold should come.'⁽⁸⁶⁾ The portents that accompanied the death of Jesus are signs of the impending destruction of the temple.⁽⁸⁷⁾ Since the Israelites had rejected Jesus the Gentiles are called to fill the number promised to Abraham.⁽⁸⁸⁾ In spite of all difficulties the truth everywhere prevailed,⁽⁸⁹⁾ and though an opportunity was sought for a

82. Rec. I 37.2.83. Rec. I 37.3. - 38.584. Rec. I 39.2.85. Rec. I 40.1.86. Rec. I 40.4.87. Rec. I 41.3.88. Rec. I 42.189. Rec. I 43.1.

discussion with the Jews seven years passed from the passion and 'the Church of God, established in Jerusalem, being most copiously multiplied was growing, governed by the most righteous ordering of James, who was ordained bishop in it by the Lord.' (90)

From this point on the interest shifts to the dispute with the Jews for which the recital of salvation history has prepared. The salvation history itself is curious. The dominant thought is the removal of the Jewish sacrifices; this is the whole point of salvation history. Christology as such is of no importance. Even the death of Jesus is mentioned not for its saving significance but because the signs that accompany it indicate the future destruction of the Temple. The events of Christ's life are mentioned but have no saving significance. The central place in this salvation history is taken not by Christ at all, but by the idea of the end of the Jewish sacrifices, and, if we link this with the theme of the true prophet, the re-establishing of the eternal law given by Moses and by Adam. (91) How the coming or the death of Christ achieves this is neither stated nor suggested. Where the theme of the true prophet suggests a movement that bears little relation to history, the theme of salvation history here indicates a line from Abraham to the Gentile Church, but in this line Christ plays a rather insignificant part.

90. Rec. I 43.3.

91. See above p. 214

III THE ACTS OF PAUL

There are only two passages in the Acts of Paul that claim our attention here in connection with salvation history. Both are in material attributed to Paul and are closely related to each other. The first is in III Corinthians 3.1 - 23 (the first part of Paul's letter to the Corinthians), and the second is Paul's speech on his arrival in Italy (section 10).⁽⁹²⁾ The Acts of Paul is not extant in its entirety, and some of the sections that we have are in a fragmentary state. Also the exact relationship of some of the sections to each other is not at all clear.⁽⁹³⁾ Some sections of the work circulated separately from an early date, but the evidence does not seem to indicate that these

92. There is no critical edition of the Acts of Paul, and for the present study the following have been used: Papyrus Bodmer X: Correspondance apocryphe des Corinthiens et de l'apôtre Paul, edited by M. Testuz (Geneva, 1959); ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΠΑΥΛΟΥ Acta Pauli. Nach dem Papyrus der Hamburger Staats- und Universitäts-Bibliothek, edited by C. Schmidt; Unter Mitarbeit von W. Schubart (Hamburg, 1936; = Veröffentlichungen aus der Hamburger Staats- und Universitäts-Bibliothek, N.F. 2); Acta Pauli aus der heidelberger koptischen Papyrus-handschrift Nr. 1, edited by Carl Schmidt, 2nd ed. (Leipzig, 1905). The translation used is that by Schneemelcher in NTA II, pp. 352 - 90, who also gives a useful list of the extant remains (*ibid.*, pp. 325ff.).
93. Schneemelcher (NTA II, pp. 327 - 49) devotes a long section of his introduction to the reconstruction and composition of the work.

sections represent traditions that were independent of the work as a whole before the work was compiled. This applies especially to III Corinthians which was later transmitted as an independent piece. However, the attempt by Testuz⁽⁹⁴⁾ to prove that III Corinthians existed as an entity before the formation of The Acts of Paul and was incorporated into it by the author must be regarded as having failed.⁽⁹⁵⁾ Although the work clearly gathers up the current traditions about Paul, in its written form it is to be dated in the last decades of the second Century, in Asia Minor.⁽⁹⁶⁾ It is, in other words, the work of a contemporary of Irenaeus. The work is not a theological treatise, but was nevertheless

94. Papyrus Bodmer X, pp. 23 - 25.

95. See Schneemelcher, NTA II, pp. 341f. Another attempt has been made more recently by A.F.J. Klijn ('The Apocryphal Correspondence between Paul and the Corinthians', in VC 17, 1963, pp. 2 - 23, esp. pp. 10 - 16) to show that the correspondence existed independently of the Acts of Paul and was incorporated into it by the author of the latter. Klijn's case rests in the first place on discrepancies between III Cor. and the Acts, which in his opinion show that the two are independent, and in the second place on three points at which the text of III Cor. may have influenced the Acts. The evidence is extremely tenuous and probably points not to the independent existence of III Cor. prior to its incorporation into the Acts of Paul, but to the complex nature of the textual tradition of the work as a whole. Cf. also A. Harnack 'Untersuchungen über den apokryphen Briefwechsel der Korinther mit dem Apostel Paulus', in Sitzb. der Kön. preuss. Akad. 1905 I, pp. 3 - 35 esp. 28ff. where Harnack anticipates some of Klijn's points.

certain theological views that are clearly expressed.⁽⁹⁷⁾

Apart from the insistence on sexual purity as a means to attaining the resurrection, the author rejects Gnosticism, and it is in the light of this that the use of salvation history in the mouth of Paul becomes of particular interest here.

The content of Paul's letter to the Corinthians is dictated by the letter written by the Corinthians to Paul, in which they complain that certain people have been perverting the faith, maintaining various false opinions. 'We must not, they say, appeal to the prophets, and that God is not almighty, and that there is no resurrection of the flesh, and that the creation of man is not God's work, and that the Lord is not come in the flesh, nor was he born of Mary, and that the world is not of God, but of the angels.'⁽⁹⁸⁾ With the exception of the question of the resurrection of the flesh which is considered separately⁽⁹⁹⁾

96. The primary evidence for both date and place is Tertullian (De Baptismo 17). See Schneemelcher, NTA II, pp. 323ff.

97. These are expressed above all in the speeches and in III Cor. Of the speeches Schneemelcher says: 'these speeches were probably shaped in close connection with the preaching of the period, and a careful interpretation of them shows what the Christians of the 2nd century believed and how they talked about God and Christ, sin and grace, salvation and judgement.' (NTA II, pp. 350f.). Cf. Schmidt, ΗΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΠΑΥΛΟΥ, pp. 104 - 08. From this point of view the speeches and III Cor. are of similar importance.

98. III Cor. 1.10 - 15.

99. III Cor. 3.24 - 32.

these problems are dealt with in the opening section of Paul's letter. The answers all hang together in a fairly coherent pattern. The key is the assertion that 'heaven and earth and all that in them is are not works of the Father.'⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ On the rejection of this hangs all that 'Paul' says about the other problems. On the fact that all things are the work of God depends the redemption of man; 'and since man was moulded by his Father, for this reason was he sought when he was lost, that he might be quickened by adoption into sonship.'⁽¹⁰¹⁾ God is righteous and would not repudiate his creation.⁽¹⁰²⁾ Already here we have the suggestion of a movement towards adoption into sonship for man. At the same time man is in bondage,⁽¹⁰³⁾ and on the basis of this and man's creation by God lies the idea of redemption, especially redemption of the flesh. 'For the almighty God, who made heaven and earth, first sent the prophets to the Jews, that they might be drawn away from their sins.'⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ God had determined to save Israel.⁽¹⁰⁵⁾

100. III Cor. 3.19. Klijn (art. cit., pp. 21f.) notes that the false teaching is rejected in a connected way, but begins, so to speak, from the other end. 'The starting point is that Christ has come into the flesh. Next it is said that therefore the flesh will be saved (3.4 - 8). This again proves that God created the flesh. This is corroborated by the prophets who possessed parts of the Spirit of Christ and were persecuted by the ruler of this world.' Cf. Schmidt, ΝΡΑΖΕΙΙ ΠΑΥΛΟΥ, p. 107.

101. III Cor. 3.7, 8.

102. III Cor. 3.12.

103. III Cor. 3.11.

104. III Cor. 3.9.

105. III Cor. 3.10.

At this point we may refer to our second passage in The Acts of Paul, for there the salvation history of Israel is described in more detail from the Exodus to Canaan, and God 'sent them in addition prophets to proclaim our Lord Jesus Christ'.⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ The history of Israel, then, looks towards Christ as the means of God's redemption. Not only did the prophets proclaim Christ, they 'in succession received share and portion of the Spirit of Christ'.⁽¹⁰⁷⁾ The prophecy is Christocentric not just in that it points to Christ, but in that the prophets themselves share in Christ's spirit. The prophets, however, were persecuted by the people of Israel, and the people of Israel, 'having thus forsaken the living God according to their own desires, forfeited the eternal inheritance.'⁽¹⁰⁸⁾

The movement towards the redemption of man and the fulfilment of the salvation history reaches its goal in the Incarnation. Christ's connection with Israel's history is emphasised in the first place by the statement that he is of the seed of David.⁽¹⁰⁹⁾ From David Mary is descended, and in her womb takes place the union of the divine and human in Christ; God 'sent down a spirit of power into the flesh, that is, into Mary the Galilean, according to the prophetic word.'⁽¹¹⁰⁾

106. Ham. Pap. (= Hamburg Papyrus - ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΠΑΥΛΟΥ) 8.16f.
(= NTA II, p. 381).

107. Ham. Pap. 8.17f.; cf. III Cor. 3.10.

108. Ham. Pap. 8.20f.

109. III Cor. 3.5.

110. Ham. Pap. 8.25 - 27; cf. III Cor. 3.5.

This takes place, moreover 'in these last times'.⁽¹¹¹⁾ The Spirit that descends on Mary clearly represents the divinity of Christ, but whether we should go so far as to speak of a Spirit-Christology here is another matter.⁽¹¹²⁾ The Acts of Paul is a religious tract, not a work of systematic theology, and the precise use of terms implied in the designation 'Spirit-Christology' is not to be expected. In connection with the Gnostic denial that the world is the work of the Father, the real emphasis of this work lies on the humanity of Christ and his association with mankind. Christ 'was conceived and borne by her (sc. Mary) as the fruit of her womb until she was delivered and gave birth to Jesus the Christ . . .'⁽¹¹³⁾ Christ is 'the fruit of her womb'. In this way the connection with the flesh of man is maintained. God did not repudiate his creation, but 'sent the (Holy) Spirit (through fire) into Mary the Galilean, . . . and she received the Holy Spirit in her womb that Jesus might enter

111. Ham. Pap. 8.25f.

112. Loofs (Theophilus von Antiochien, pp. 148 - 57) begins from the passages in III Cor. which exhibit relatively clear indications of a Spirit-Christology and elaborates this from other statements in the Acts of Paul into a precise Christological pattern. The problem raised by Loofs's approach is not that it leads to wrong conclusions but that it is not a valid approach in a document of this kind. To treat a work of popular theology as a theological treatise is akin to treating a newspaper as a scholarly investigation. See further, Schneemelcher, NTA II, pp. 349f.; cf. Klijn, art. cit., p. 17. Schmidt (ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΠΑΥΛΟΥ, p. 108) accepts Loofs' conclusions.

113. Ham. Pap. 8.27f.

into the world.⁽¹¹⁴⁾ This close link of Christ with man is particularly clear in the understanding of redemption. Christ became flesh in Mary of the seed of David, 'that he might come into this world and redeem all flesh through his own flesh, and that he might raise up from the dead us who are fleshly, even as he has shown himself as our example.'⁽¹¹⁵⁾ The Gnostic denial that all things are the work of God is rejected in the assertion of the reality of the Incarnation and the purpose of redemption to save the flesh created by God. The redemption of the flesh is above all shown in the resurrection of Christ in the flesh, man is thus freed from the slavery to the evil one, who is conquered 'through the same flesh by which he held sway'.⁽¹¹⁶⁾ In this way man reaches his adoption as son and his freedom from evil through the flesh of Christ, the flesh which Christ shares with all men through Mary. The emphasis in salvation lies on the Incarnation and resurrection. The death on the cross has of itself no saving significance; it is the pre-requisite for the resurrection.⁽¹¹⁷⁾

Through his taking of flesh and raising it Christ forms a new community, 'a temple of righteousness in his body,

114. III Cor. 3.13f.; cf. Ham. Pap. 8.25ff. The textual witnesses of III Cor. vary at this point. See the notes in Schneemelcher (NTA II, p. 376) and the comments of Klijn (art. cit., pp. 8f.).

115. III Cor. 3.6.

116. III Cor. 3.15.

117. Cf. Testuz, op. cit., p. 21.

through whom we are redeemed'.⁽¹¹⁸⁾ Although it is not stated explicitly that this new community replaces Israel who forfeited its inheritance, the implication is plainly there. The Church is the successor to Israel in the salvation history. The validity too of the Church's teaching is mediated historically; 'for I delivered to you in the beginning what I received from the apostles who were before me, who at all times were together with the Lord Jesus Christ.'⁽¹¹⁹⁾ This the real Paul would not have said,⁽¹²⁰⁾ but the concern of the author of The Acts of Paul for the historical tradition is obvious. The children of Israel forfeited their inheritance which they had been given in their salvation history, but, says 'Paul', 'If we endure, we shall have access to the Lord, and shall receive as the refuge and shield of his good pleasure Jesus Christ, who gave himself for us, if at least ye receive the word so as it is.'⁽¹²¹⁾ Furthermore, the eschatological climax is not far off, 'for (my) Lord Jesus Christ will quickly come,'⁽¹²²⁾ and 'the time of the resurrection is proclaimed.'⁽¹²³⁾

118. III Cor. 3.17f.

119. III Cor. 3.4.

120. Cf. I Cor. 15.3; Gal. 1.17f. See Klijn, art. cit., p. 7.

121. Ham. Pap. 8.22 - 25. The text of the last phrase is in some confusion. The translation of Schneemelcher is given but of. the critical apparatus of Schmidt.

122. III Cor. 3.3.

123. III Cor. 3.23. This verse and the preceding one are not contained in the Bodmer Papyrus and may be later additions. See Klijn, art. cit., p. 9.

The primary concern of these passages in The Acts of Paul is anti-docetic, but, nevertheless, the idea of a Christocentric salvation history is also present in the outline of the history of Israel, in the Christocentric prophecy, in the Church as the legitimate inheritor of the promises. Also, although it is not integrated into a total perspective of salvation history, there is the notion of man's development towards sonship by adoption, in which the coming of Christ in man's flesh is of such vital importance; man's salvation is rooted in the nature of the risen Christ. Some of the features of this Christocentric salvation history will return in a much more developed framework in Irenaeus, notably the scheme of salvation history itself and, above all, the connection between the salvation of man, flesh and all, and the coming of Christ in the flesh. In Irenaeus there is the added point that the flesh of man is in the first instance part of the creative work of the Word of God, and thus the whole idea is much more unified than it is here. Of the Logos-doctrine there is no trace in The Acts of Paul. The Acts of Paul illustrates an approach to the attack on Gnosticism that has some similarities to the major attack launched by Irenaeus.

IV. THE ASCENSION OF ISAIAH

The Christian sections of this work, namely the Vision of Isaiah (chh. 6 - 11) and the Testament of Hezekiah⁽¹²⁴⁾

124. Asc. Is. 3.13 - 5.1, in which is given a vision of the descent and ascent of the Beloved, an account of the

probably stem from the second Century.⁽¹²⁵⁾ It is with these sections alone that we are concerned here. In the vision proper (chh. 6 - 11) there is a further extraneous unit (11. 2 - 22) that deals in some detail with the birth of Jesus and also briefly with his life, ministry, death and resurrection.⁽¹²⁶⁾ In form the work is an apocalypse, the major theme of which is Isaiah's vision of the descent and ascent of the Redeemer.

At first sight there is little of interest in the Ascension of Isaiah for a study centred on salvation history.

124. (contd.) state of the Church and a description of the end of the world.

125. No precise date can be set for the composition of the work. G.H. Box (in The Ascension of Isaiah, by R.H. Charles, with an Introduction by G.H. Box, London, 1919) on the authority of Charles assigns the combination of the three parts of the work to the second Century, but concedes that the individual parts were all in existence in the first century (op. cit., pp. vii, x). A.Ll. Davies (art. 'Ascension of Isaiah', in Dictionary of the Apostolic Church, ed. James Hastings, Edinburgh, 1915, Vol. I, pp. 99 - 102) agrees with Charles in the main, and sets the Testament of Hezekiah at 'not later than A.D. 100' (op. cit., p. 99). Flemming and Duensing (NTA II, pp. 642ff.) place the Vision of Isaiah in the second century. Daniélou, (op. cit., pp. 12 - 14) places the whole work 'between the years 80 and 90' in Antioch. M. Rist (in The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, New York, 1962, Vol. 2, cols. 744 - 46) sets the Testament of Hezekiah in the late first or early second century, but the Vision of Isaiah at about 200 A.D. The translation used is that in NTA II, pp. 644 - 63.

126. See Flemming and Duensing, NTA II, p. 643.

There is almost no concern in the work for the passage of time and the events of human history, let alone salvation history. The deeds of the children of Israel are mentioned, indeed they are recorded in books in the seventh heaven (9.22), but the interest is not in acts of salvation. When Isaiah ascends to the firmament he sees there the hosts of Sammael engaged in a great struggle, and the angels of Satan envious of one another. This situation moreover reflects the situation on earth (7.9f.), and the angel accompanying Isaiah explains: 'So it has been, since this world began until now, and this struggle (will continue) till he whom thou shalt see shall come and destroy him (Satan)' (7.12). The coming of Christ, then, will mark the end of something that has been going on throughout history; Christ will in fact come 'in the last days' (9.13), and the vision of Isaiah 'will be consummated in the 1st generation' (11.38), but that is the extent of the interest in time and history as such.

At the end of the first section of this study we pointed out that Heilsgeschichte, in the sense in which it is used by Cullmann, may convey one of two ideas or both of them: history interpreted as the saving acts of God, and history as the locus of the working out of the divine plan.⁽¹²⁷⁾ Of the former idea there is nothing in the Ascension of Isaiah, nor even of the latter in the sense of a divine plan worked out in the course of history. There is however a divine plan and it does concern history at least in so far as it involves the Incarnation. To this plan, therefore, in the

127. See above pp. 53 - 64.

Ascension of Isaiah we shall devote a little more attention, and to the Christology of the work in the light of that plan. (128)

The descent and ascent of the Redeemer is recounted no fewer than four times in the work: In the Testament of Hezekiah, Beliar is angry because through Isaiah the descent and ascent of the Beloved had been revealed (3.13 - 20); the angel who accompanies Isaiah tells him what he is about to see in his vision (9.12 - 18); Isaiah hears the instructions of the Father to the Son (10.7 - 15); finally Isaiah sees the Son descend and ascend (10.17 - 11.33). The accounts differ in detail, the vision of the descent itself being the fullest account; in basic structure, however, the accounts are the same, the hidden descent followed by the glorious ascent. (129)

The descent and ascent is not referred to as a plan but it nevertheless takes place in accordance with the will of the Father, who gives instructions to the Son: 'And I heard the words of the Most High, the Father of my Lord, as he spoke to my Lord Christ who shall be called Jesus' (10.7). There is a clear subordination of the Son implied

128. This aspect of the divine economy of salvation will be of more importance when, in the next section, we discuss Gnosticism.

129. If the descent and ascent are divided into the following eight sections, descent, incarnation, crucifixion and death, descensus ad inferos, resurrection, founding of the Church, ascension, and session at the Father's right hand, the only sections which all four accounts have in common are the descent and ascent.

in this situation, and this is borne out by other statements in the work. To speak of the Son as subordinate does not in this context imply that the work is heterodox; it simply reflects the archaic nature of the trinitarian theology underlying the work. In the seventh heaven, Isaiah 'saw one standing whose glory surpassed that of all, and his glory was great and wonderful... . All the righteous whom I had seen and all the angels whom I had seen came unto him' and in turn they worship him (9.27 - 29). The angel explains: 'This is the Lord of all glory whom thou hast seen' (9.32). Alongside this figure is another on his left, who is also worshipped by the righteous and the angels, and it is explained to Isaiah: 'This is the angel of the holy Spirit, who speaks through thee and the rest of the righteous' (9.33 - 36). These two figures approach Isaiah and tell him that he is allowed to see God (9.39): 'And I saw how my Lord worshipped, and the angel of the Holy Spirit, and how both together praised God' (9.40). The trinitarian theology is expressed in angelomorphic terms, but the second and third persons of the trinity are not simply angels; they surpass all the angels and the righteous and receive worship from both, and the angel of the Spirit spoke through the prophets.⁽¹³⁰⁾ It is only in the fact that the Lord and angel of the Spirit worship God that any subordination is

130. As Daniélou points out *op.cit.*, pp. 127 - 131, esp. pp. 128f.), the angel of the Spirit here is none other than the Holy Spirit himself, presented in details borrowed from the Jewish figure of Gabriel. See also R.N. Longenecker, The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity (London, 1970; = SBT 2nd Series 17), pp. 26 - 32.

expressed. When Christ ascends back to the seventh heaven he takes his seat on the right of 'the great glory' and the Holy Spirit sits on the left, clearly exalted above all creatures including the angels (11.32f.). The doctrine of God is expressed in terms of angels but it is nevertheless a trinitarian theology.⁽¹³¹⁾ Furthermore, the Father explains to Christ the reason for the hidden descent in the following terms: 'And none of the angels of this world will know that thou, along with me, art the Lord of the seven heavens and of their angels. And they will not know that thou art mine till . . .' (10.11f.). This, then, is the Lord Christ whom the Father wills to send on his journey of descent and ascent.

The Lord Christ descends⁽¹³²⁾ incognito by adopting on

131. On the passage from the work just quoted Daniélou says: 'There is strict parallelism here between the Beloved and the Holy Spirit; they share the same divine glory. These are among the most ancient Christian trinitarian texts, but in them the Second and Third Persons are presented in angelomorphic terms' (op. cit., p. 129). Davies (art. cit., p. 100) refers to these ideas as 'undeveloped Trinitarian conceptions'. On this form of trinitarian theology as the earliest form of the doctrine of the Trinity see esp. G. Kretschmar, Studien zur frühchristlichen Trinitätstheologie (Tübingen, 1956; = Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 21), chh. 3 and 4.
132. On the hidden descent see Daniélou (op. cit., pp. 206 - 14). A. Ll. Davies considers that both the descent and the idea of transformation have a gnostic colouring (art. cit., p. 100), but, as Daniélou points out (pp. 210ff.) there is a marked difference in context between the Jewish Christian idea of the descent and the use of the same idea in Gnosticism. In Gnosticism 'the powers are now the planetary powers, the cosmocrators who dominate the lower

the way down through the heavens the form of the angels in each of the heavens. (133) This is purely for the sake of disguise, since at the very end of the descent in the realm of the dead Christ even there assumes the likeness of the angels; (134) Christ does not become an angel. The disguise is put on in the fifth heaven and changed with each successively lower level. (135) When the occasion demands it Christ gives the appropriate pass-word. (136) All this is for the sake of escaping detection (9.15). The same is true in a sense of his becoming man; the Beloved is transformed into the likeness of man (3.13), and the angel explains to Isaiah that Christ will descend and become like man in appearance, 'and they will think that he is flesh and a man.' The docetism which can so easily be read into this does not really come into question; the emphasis lies here not on the semblance of Christ's humanity but on the fact that he was not recognised. (137) This is made quite clear in the insertion

132.(contd.) world, the work of the Demiurge' (p. 210). See also Longenecker, op. cit., pp. 58 - 62, who also regards the theme of descent and ascent as of a feature of Palestinian Jewish Christianity.

133. Asc. Is. 10.9f.; 10.17 - 31. On the Jewish Christian cosmology underlying this see Daniélou, op. cit., pp. 173 - 81.

134. Asc. Is. 10.10. Cf. Daniélou, op. cit., pp. 208f.

135. Asc. Is. 10.9; 10.20ff.

136. Asc. Is. 10.24, 25, 27, 29; Cf. 10.31.

137. A. Ll. Davies (art. cit., p. 100) notes this docetic tendency. Cf. Daniélou: 'There is thus a common train of thought in which the Word becomes a man among men, as he was an angel amongst angels, in order not to be

in chapter 11: 'this was hidden from all the heavens and all the princes and every god of this world. And I saw: in Nazareth he sucked the breast like a baby, as was customary, so that he would not be recognized' (11.16f.). The same is true with regard to the crucifixion and death. The docetic notion that Christ in some way escaped death is not in evidence; the children of Israel, 'not knowing who he was, delivered him to the king and crucified him.' (138)

The descent includes also a descent to the under-world.⁽¹³⁹⁾ This takes place after the crucifixion and before the resurrection; the descent is as far as Sheol, but not to Hades (10.8). The redemption brought about by means of this hidden descent becomes apparent at this point. Being who he is, Christ's descent incognito into the realm of death brings about the despoiling of the angel of death (9.16); Christ comes to 'judge and destroy the prince and his angels and the gods of this world and the world which is ruled by them,' for they have denied God and claimed alone to exist (10.12f.). These are none other than the angels of death as the very next sentence states: 'And afterwards thou wilt ascend from the angels of death to thy place.'⁽¹⁴⁰⁾ This victory of Christ

137. (Contd.) known. In Gnosticism this corresponds to a Docetist tendency and a denial of the Incarnation. In the Ascension of Isaiah, however, it is accompanied by an affirmation of the Incarnation, and simply underlines the fact that this Incarnation is hidden from men as it is from angels' (op. cit., p. 211). However, it is true that the miraculous manner of Christ's birth is stressed, as e.g. in Asc. Is. 11.8ff. See Daniélou, op. cit., p. 215.

138. Asc. Is. 11.19; cf. 9.14.

is acknowledged by the fact that in his ascent the angels of the firmament and Satan worship him (11.23f.). Christ's descent to Sheol also brings about the release of the righteous who have been kept there. The garment which is put on in place of the flesh is received in the seventh heaven (9.7 - 11), and because of Christ's descensus ad inferos 'many of the righteous will ascend with him, whose spirits do not receive their garments till the Lord Christ ascends and they ascend with him' (9.17). Even the righteous in the seventh heaven do not receive their thrones and crowns until Christ has descended and ascended. (141)

139. Asc. Is. 10.8; 11.19. ch. 3 nn. 63 and 116, n.140 below, ch.5 n.191, and pp. 677f.

140. Asc. Is. 10.14. Daniélou (op. cit., pp. 233f., 243f.) rightly draws a distinction between Satan and the evil angels who live on the firmament, and the angel of death who guards the souls of the righteous in Sheol. (cf. Acta Pil. 20.1f. = NTA I pp.472ff.) In his descent the Word passes through the angels on the firmament and so down to earth and eventually to Sheol. In other words the angel of death is not to be equated with Satan and his angels. However, it appears that some close association was seen between the two by the author of the Ascension of Isaiah, since he inserts between the account of the descent of Christ to Sheol and his ascent from Sheol a statement about the judgement and destruction of the prince and his angels (Asc. Is. 10.11 - 13), a passage which Daniélou omits from his quotation of the section 10.8 - 14 (op. cit., pp. 243f.), in which he sees a clear statement of the descent of Christ to Sheol as simply a descent to the abode of the dead. The insertion of the verses 11 - 13 seems to indicate that even in the Ascension of Isaiah the process was under way whereby the defeat of the angels on the firmament

Because Christ's victory over death is by means of death on the cross, redemption is by faith in the cross (3.18).

The resurrection, described (3.16f.) in terms reminiscent of the Gospel of Peter,⁽¹⁴²⁾ is succeeded by a period of 545 days in which Christ remains in this world.⁽¹⁴³⁾ After his resurrection Christ sends out his twelve apostles,⁽¹⁴⁴⁾ who 'will teach to all the nations and every tongue the resurrection of the Beloved, and that those who believe on his cross will be saved, and in his ascension to the seventh heaven, whence he came.'⁽¹⁴⁵⁾ Thus the mission of the Church is established, though the angel of the Church had already descended, after the crucifixion and before the resurrection (3.15). 'By the Angel of the Church the author means the Church itself in its pre-existent reality.'⁽¹⁴⁶⁾

In contrast to the hidden descent, the ascent⁽¹⁴⁷⁾

140.(contd.) became entangled with the theme of the descent to Sheol and eventually the defeat of Satan is thought to take place in Hades after the passion. Daniélou acknowledges that this was the case by the end of the second century (op. cit., p. 234).

141. Asc. Is. 9.10 - 12, 13, 18.

142. Ev. Pet. 35 - 40.

143. Asc. Is. 9.16; cf. 11.21. The prolongation of the period between the resurrection and the ascension is a feature of Jewish Christian theology (See Daniélou, op. cit., pp. 251ff.) and also of Gnosticism.

144. Asc. Is. 11.22; cf. 3.17; - 12 disciples.

145. Asc. Is. 3.18; cf. 3.21ff.

146. Daniélou, op. cit., p. 298.

147. The Ascension itself is quite distinct from the return from Sheol. See Daniélou, op. cit., pp. 250f.

takes place in full splendour⁽¹⁴⁸⁾ and, in the fourth account, is described in some detail.⁽¹⁴⁹⁾ Throughout the ascent Christ is praised and worshipped by all, and in the seventh heaven he takes his place on the right of the great glory, with the angel of the holy Spirit on the left.⁽¹⁵⁰⁾ So the drama of the descent and ascent of the redeemer is completed.

As we have already indicated, there is not the slightest suggestion of salvation history in this drama. Even the Incarnation in which the drama comes into contact with human history is not considered as a point in the historical process. The interest for our present study lies in the fact that here a divine plan of redemption is carried out (though it is not even called a plan), and is carried out in every detail by Christ; the drama of redemption is thoroughly Christocentric. The only active agent of redemption is Christ. In Gnosticism we shall meet again the idea of a Christocentric plan of salvation that is sometimes quite detached from history. It is in Irenaeus that we find the Christocentric plan of salvation wedded to the idea of salvation history.

148. As Daniélou points out (op. cit., pp. 251f.), the glory and splendour attend not the resurrection but the ascension of Christ; the same point is noted by A.Ll. Davies, art. cit., p. 100.

149. Asc. Is. 11.22 - 32; cf. 3.18; 9.17; 10.14.

150. Asc. Is. 11.32f.; cf. 10.14f.

V OTHER APOCRYPHAL LITERATURE

In the literature so far considered themes have occurred that are also to be found in other apocryphal writings, though not necessarily in association with any idea of salvation history or of a divine plan of salvation. On occasion, however, there is a possible connection with our theme, though there is insufficient material in the writing concerned to construct a coherent pattern of the relationship between Christology and salvation history for that writing. The remaining works therefore will not be considered individually, but the items of interest here will be presented under thematic headings.

One theme which is capable of being included in the concept of salvation history is that of the history of Israel and the corresponding history of the Church. Our major concern is with Christology regarded from the point of view of salvation history, and although the fact that the Church replaces the children of Israel as the chosen people of God is not in itself of interest here, the history of Israel is sometimes understood as a negative history of rebellion against God culminating in the rejection and crucifixion of Jesus, leading to the calling of the Gentiles as the people of God.

This theme emerges with particular clarity in V Esra (= II Esdras 1 and 2).⁽¹⁵¹⁾ The author recounts the acts

151. Duensing (in NTA II, pp. 689 - 703) dates the section known as V Esra 'around AD 200' (p. 689). O. Plöger ('Das 5 and 6 Esrabuch', in RGG³, Vol. 2, cols. 699f.)

of God on Israel's behalf at considerable length. But this is no recital of the acts of salvation history. Rather it is a recital of the way in which Israel at every turn has spurned the advances of God.⁽¹⁵²⁾ The Old Testament prophets did the same but there it was done in order to stir Israel to shame and repentance. There is no call to repentance now; God has finally rejected Israel altogether.⁽¹⁵³⁾ The place of Israel will be taken by the new people of God. The Lord commands Esra: 'Tell my people that I will give to them the kingdom of Jerusalem which I would have given to Israel. I will take unto me the glory of these (the Israelites) and give to those (my people) the everlasting tabernacles which I had prepared for them (Israel)' (2.10f.). Esra speaks comfort not to Israel but to the new chosen people (2.14 - 32). The fact that they are the new people does not mean that God turned to them only when Israel failed. So convinced is the author of Israel's rebelliousness that he can say that the new people of God have been called 'from the beginning' (2.41). The new people are the Gentiles (2.34), whom Esra urges to wait for their shepherd who will come 'at the end of the world' (2.34.). From the point of view of Christology none of this is

151.(contd.) refers it to the second half of the second century. The translation used here is that by Duensing.

152. V. Esra 1.4 - 6 etc. 153. V. Esra 1.24ff.; 1.30 etc.

154. Cf. Ev. Pet. 40; Hermas, Pastor 83.1.

important; Christ has no role here, but, in the final scene, Esra 'saw upon Mount Zion a great company, which I could not number, and they all praised the Lord with songs. In the midst of them was a young man, tall of stature, towering above all the rest, and he set a crown upon the head of each one of them and he waxed ever taller' (2.42f.). When Esra asks who this young man is an angel tells him, 'This is the Son of God whom they have confessed in the world' (2.47). The figure of the tall young man is familiar from other literature,⁽¹⁵⁴⁾ but there is no direct connection here between the Christology expressed in this exalted figure and the negative salvation history that precedes this passage. The real interest of the author is not in salvation history at all but in the way in which the Church has supplanted Israel in the covenant with God. No indication is given of how the advent of Christ brings about the transition from one to the other.

In the Christian interpolations in Book I of the Sibylline Oracles⁽¹⁵⁵⁾ we meet again this theme of the

155. The date of the Christian interpolations in the Sibylline Oracles cannot be determined with any accuracy. The only books that have any material relating to the present study are I and VIII. In general, the Christian material is assigned to the third century. However, there is some evidence that parts of Book VIII may have been extant before 180 AD (see especially J. Geffcken, Komposition und Entstehungszeit der Oracula Sibyllina, Leipzig, 1902; = TU 23/1, and A. Kurfess, in NTA II, pp. 703 - 09).

rejection of Israel in favour of the Church, but in this case, the role of Christ in the transition from one to the other is given greater emphasis. It also becomes clear in this case that the interest in the history of Israel has nothing to do with salvation history. Here the rejection of Christ by the Jews is simply recounted.⁽¹⁵⁶⁾ The history when it is told, as in V Esra, is told for the examples it offers not for any value in the history as history.

155.(contd.) Books I and II form a unity and there is clearly a relationship between the Christian sections of Books I and II and those in Book VIII. The general opinion is that the Jewish substratum of Books I and II is to be dated to the first half of the first century and that the Christian interpolations of Book VIII are dependent on those in Books I and II, which can therefore be dated to c. 150 AD. Geffcken in particular dissents from this view, regarding the Jewish substratum of Books I and II as a third century composition and the Christian interpolations as slightly later and dependent on those in Book VIII. See further A. Rzach, in Pauly - Wissowa - Kroll, II/2, cols. 2117 - 69; J. Michl, in Lex. f. Theol. u. Kirche, IX, cols. 728f.; E. Amann, in Dict. de theol. cath. 14/2, cols. 2027 - 32; F.L. Cross, The Early Christian Fathers, pp. 191f.; J. Moffatt, in Dict. of the Apost. Church, vol. 2, pp. 477 - 90; A. Kurfess, 'Oracula Sibyllina I/II', in ZNTW 40(1941), pp. 151 - 65. The translation used is that in NTA II, pp. 709 - 45, and the edition used is that of Geffcken (Die Oracula Sibyllina, edited by J. Geffcken, Leipzig, 1902; = GCS 8)

156. Sib. Or. I 360ff.

Hand in hand with the rejection of Israel goes the dissolution of the Law.⁽¹⁵⁷⁾ Here however, there is a greater awareness of a development that has its crucial phase in the coming of Christ. When he comes, 'in him shall all the law be dissolved, which from the beginning was given to men in ordinances because of a disobedient people.'⁽¹⁵⁸⁾ Here it is not simply a question of the disobedient Jews, though they certainly are included;⁽¹⁵⁹⁾ the law in question includes also the 'secret law' by which men serve 'the phantoms of the world'.⁽¹⁶⁰⁾ This law is removed and 'the hidden truth was again revealed when the eternal Master came down upon earth.'⁽¹⁶¹⁾ The idea here is not so much of development as of restoration; the hidden truth is revealed again in Christ. Here again the events of Israel's history, including the Law are not seen as part of the divine history of salvation.

Another theme which was capable of being integrated into a pattern of salvation history was the descensus ad inferos. In Irenaeus the salvation of Adam and the Patriarchs by Christ in his descent to the underworld is part of the divine plan of salvation.⁽¹⁶²⁾ This is not the case in the literature that we have been discussing, but the theme was nevertheless there to be used. Apart from the material we have already discussed the theme occurs in the Gospel of Peter, where at the resurrection

157. Sib. Or. VIII 299ff. 158. Sib. Or. VIII 300f.

159. Cf. Sib. Or. VIII 296. 160. Sib. Or. VIII 307f.

161. Sib. Or. VIII 308f. 162. See below, pp. 677ff.

a voice from heaven cries: "Thou hast preached to them that sleep", and from the cross there was heard the answer, "Yea".⁽¹⁶³⁾ In Book VIII of the Sibylline Oracles Christ descends to Hades, 'announcing hope to all the saints'.⁽¹⁶⁴⁾ In these cases there is no specific connection with salvation history.

A third theme which lends itself to integration into a scheme of salvation history is the association between creation and the coming of Christ interpreted as the start of a new creation or as the decisive point of development of the old creation. This does not mean that wherever creation and re-creation are mentioned there is some idea of salvation history, but given these two points, it is not difficult to interpret these events as stages in man's development reaching through history, the crucial event of which is the coming of Christ. So far, where we have seen this theme, we have not found it used as part of a fully-developed awareness of salvation history. In fact it is not until we find it in Irenaeus that we see it in its developed form.⁽¹⁶⁵⁾ Prior to that the materials are there⁽¹⁶⁶⁾ but are not gathered into a single, coherent, theological picture. Some elements of this theme are to be found in isolation in the Sibylline Oracles.

163. Ev. Pet. 41f. The passage may have been intended as a question: 'Hast thou preached . . . ?'

164. Sib. Or. VIII 310f.

165. See below, pp. 641ff.

166. E.g. in the idea that the flesh itself is redeemed through Christ's coming in the flesh, as in the Epistula Apostolorum (see above pp. 146f), and in III Corinthians (see above, pp. 227f), and in the idea of Christ as the

In Book VIII of the Sibylline Oracles a clear connection is made between the creation of man in the beginning and the redemptive work of Christ. Christ comes 'not in glory but as a mortal . . . pitiable, dishonoured, unsightly, to give hope to the pitiable. And to corruptible flesh he will give form, and heavenly faith to the faithless' (lines 256 - 59). This giving of shape to man is closely linked with the original creation of man and with the idea of man's fall, led astray by the serpent 'to go to a destiny of death and receive knowledge of good and of evil, so that forsaking God he was subject to mortal customs' (lines 261 - 63). Man's predicament, however, is not simply that he has sinned and therefore requires redemption; Christ when he comes 'will give shape ($\muορφή$) to the man moulded in the beginning by God's holy hands' (lines 259f.). Redemption is not just the undoing of the effects of the fall but the completion of creation itself. The Father's intention with regard to man embraces both the initial creation of man and the perfecting of the creation by the Word: 'For him first of all did the Almighty take as counsellor in the beginning, and say: 'My child ($τέκνον$), let us two make the tribes of mortals, modelling them from our image ($εἰκῶν$): Now I ($νὺν μὲν ἐγὼ$) with my hands, and thou thereafter ($οὐ δ' ἐπειτα$) with the logos ($λόγῳ$), shall tend ($Θεραπεύω$) our figure ($\muορφή$), that we may produce a common creation ($κτίσις$):' (167) The 'tending with the logos' referred to

166. (cont.) second Adam in the Pseudo-Clementines (see above, pp.157f).

167. Sib. Or. VIII 264 - 68; cf. 439ff.

here is not the bestowal of universal reason on man, but is linked with the Incarnation, for, 'mindful of this resolve, then, will he come into the world bringing a corresponding copy ($\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\iota}\tau\upsilon\pi\omicron\nu$ *μίμημα*) to a holy virgin' (lines 269f.). The intention of God with regard to man is fulfilled when the model is fully revealed in the corresponding copy in the Incarnation. In this way form will be given to the flesh and man will receive his true shape. It is not suggested for a moment that this is in any way seen as salvation history. Nevertheless, the idea of development is there, a development in which the coming of Christ plays the crucial role. Creation takes place in two stages ($\nu\acute{\omicron}\nu$, $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha$). In Irenaeus there is a strong connection with salvation history, and, moreover, the work of Christ with regard to the redemption of creation is not completion but recapitulation. (168)

168. See below, pp. 679 - 97.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE GREEK APOLOGISTS

The common thread which links together the group of writers known as the Greek Apologists is their concern to defend and commend Christianity to the educated people of the day by means of the current philosophies. According to Athenagoras,⁽¹⁾ the three most common charges made against Christians by their detractors were that they indulged in Thyestian banquets and Oedipodean relationships, and were atheists. These charges help to explain in part the energies devoted by the Apologists to demonstrating the existence and nature of God and the ethical purity of the Christian life. The task of the Apologists, however, was not only defence but also commendation; they sought to show that in Christianity the highest ideals of Hellenistic culture reached their perfection. As a result of these pre-occupations, the questions of Christology and salvation history that concern us here are in some cases not open to discussion, since, particularly in respect of salvation history, there is insufficient evidence on which to form a valid judgement. Nevertheless, some of the works, while not requiring detailed discussion, merit a few brief comments.

1. legatio 3.

I MINOR WORKS

The Apology of Aristides⁽²⁾ has one passage of importance for Christology:

But the christians reckon their beginning from Jesus Christ. He is confessed as Son of the most high God, having descended from heaven in the Holy Spirit (ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ) for the salvation of men and was born of a holy virgin, unbegotten and immaculate (ἄσπορος τε καὶ ἄφθόρος), he assumed flesh and revealed himself to men so that he might recall them from the error of many gods. Having perfected (τελέσας) his wonderful plan (τὴν θαυμαστὴν αὐτοῦ οἰκονομίαν), by voluntary choice he tasted death on the cross to fulfil a great plan (κατ' οἰκονομίαν μεγάλην). And after three days he came to life and ascended into heaven (ch.15).

The passage is obviously based on familiar formulae. The descent of Christ from heaven is expressed in terms of a Spirit Christology.⁽³⁾ The descent brings to fruition a

2. The apology of Aristides was apparently addressed to the Emperor Antoninus Pius in the early years of his reign, i.e. c. 140 AD. It is extant in Greek in the story of Barlaam and Josaphat (see the appendix by Robinson to J.R. Harris (ed.) The Apology of Aristides on behalf of the Christians . . . with an appendix containing the main portion of the original Greek Text by J.A. Robinson (Cambridge, 1891; = Texts and Studies I/1). There is a Syriac version (published by Harris, op. cit.) and an Armenian version of the opening chapters (English and Latin translation given in Harris, op. cit.). There are discrepancies between the three versions. On the relative merits of the versions see J.A. Robinson in his appendix to Harris (op. cit.), pp. 67 - 99; cf. also J. Geffcken,

plan. Exactly what the plan signified is difficult to determine. The plan clearly relates to the Incarnation, but does it refer to more than that so that the Incarnation is the culmination of events in the divine plan of history? The reference to the death of Christ as the fulfilment of a plan would suggest that the plan envisaged more than simply the Incarnation, but the original Greek text is by no means certain at that point.⁽⁴⁾ The Syriac version

- 2.(contd.) Zwei griechische Apologeten (Leipzig & Berlin, 1907; = Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Kommentare zu griechischen und römischen Schriftstellern), pp. xxxiv ff. Geffcken published a reconstruction of the original Apology (Zwei gr. Apol.) and E. Hennecke edited the versions in parallel columns with a system of underlining to show what material was common to both (or, where applicable, all three) versions, and therefore probably part of the original Apology (Die Apologie des Aristides. Recension und Rekonstruktion des Textes by E. Hennecke, Leipzig, 1893; = TU IV/3). Any comments on detail will be given below at the appropriate point.
3. See Geffcken, Zwei gr. Apol., p. 84. The reference to the Holy Spirit is given in the Greek and Armenian but not in the Syriac.
4. With the Greek version given above compare the Syriac (ch. 2): 'This Jesus, then, was born of the tribe of the Hebrews; and He had twelve disciples, in order that a certain dispensation ($\sigma\acute{\iota}\kappa\nu\nu\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha$) of His might be fulfilled. He was pierced by the Jews; and He died and was buried; and they say that after three days He rose and ascended to heaven'. Cf. also the Armenian version (ch. 2): 'He chose the twelve disciples, and He by his illuminating truth, dispensing it ($\sigma\acute{\iota}\kappa\nu\nu\mu\acute{\iota}\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$), taught all the world, and was nailed on the cross by the Jews.'

refers the fulfilment of the plan to the fact that Christ had twelve disciples, which would effectively remove the term *οἰκονομία* from the context of the Incarnation as possibly the climax of the divine plan. There is in any case not sufficient material to deduce an idea of the divine plan of salvation carried out in its successive stages in history by Christ. There is one further reference (ch. 15), to the role of Christ and the Holy Spirit in creation; but it does not permit any conclusions to be drawn about the precise role of the Son or the Spirit in creation.

For our present purpose there is nothing in Athenagoras⁽⁵⁾ that is important. He discusses the creation at length and the role of the Logos in creation⁽⁶⁾ but there is no mention of the divine plan of redemption nor even of the

4. (contd.) Who rose from the dead and ascended into heaven, . . . ' A comparison of the three versions shows that *οἰκονομία* or a cognate word must have figured in the original, but its precise reference is difficult to determine, and there is no undoubted reference to a plan involving a sequence of times (see Geffcken, Zwei gr. Apol., p. 85).
5. The ascription of the Legatio of Athenagoras ('Marcus Aurelius Antoninus and Lucius Aurelius Commodus') indicates a date between 27 November 176 and 17 March 180 AD (See e.g. F.L. Cross, The Early Christian Fathers, p. 55). Since Athenagoras refers in his Apology to his intention of writing about the resurrection (Leg. 36), the treatise, *περὶ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν*, must date from shortly after the Apology.
6. E.g. Leg. 4, 6, 10.

Incarnation.⁽⁷⁾ Even in the treatise on the resurrection, the interest of Athenagoras lies not in the theological questions or the resurrection of Christ as the prelude to the resurrection of the faithful but in the possibility and propriety of God's raising the dead. From the point of view of Christocentric salvation history Athenagoras has nothing to offer.

Of more importance here is the work, De Resurrectione, wrongly attributed to Justin Martyr.⁽⁸⁾ The philosophical

7. R.A. Markus ('Trinitarian Theology and the Economy', in JTS n.s. 9(1958), p. 92) appeals to the use of *οἰκονομία* in Leg. 21.4 as evidence for the use of the word in the sense of 'the provisions made by God for the salvation of men within his gradually unfolding plan' but there is no suggestion whatsoever of a gradually unfolding plan in the use of *οἰκονομία* in the passage referred to.
8. As E.R. Goodenough indicates (The Theology of Justin Martyr. An Investigation into the Conceptions of Early Christian Literature and its Hellenistic and Judaistic Influences, Jena, 1923; r.p. Amsterdam, 1968, p. 79), the major argument for rejecting Justin's authorship is one of style: 'Justin's expository method as shown in the Apologies and Dialogue is anything but ordered and compact. But the author of the fragment on the Resurrection proceeds from premise to conclusion in so neat a consecutiveness that it is hard to conceive how Justin could have produced it.' (Both the author and the date when it was written must remain matters for conjecture. The edition followed here is that of J.C.T. Otto in S. Justini philosophi et martyris opera quae feruntur omnia, vol. 2, Opera Justini addubitata, 2nd ed. (Jena, 1849), pp. 208 - 45.

question of the possibility of the resurrection of the flesh is prominent in this treatise also, but there is as well a clearly drawn connection between the resurrection of the flesh and both Christology and redemption. The author of the De Resurrectione answers the same objections to the resurrection of the flesh as does Athenagoras; that it is impossible and inappropriate. To counter the objection that it is not fitting for the flesh to be raised, the author turns to the original creation of the flesh and shows that man made in the image of God is precisely the man of flesh and it is therefore absurd to say that the flesh made in the image of God is of no value (ch. 7). Furthermore, as he goes on to say (ch. 8), the promise made by God to save man must include the flesh, for man is composed of body and soul not simply one or the other and 'if then neither of these is by itself man, but that which is made up of both together is called man, and God has called man to life and resurrection, He has called not a part but the whole, which is the soul and the body'. The flesh that is raised is the flesh that died (ch. 10). Both of these arguments for the resurrection of the flesh, that the flesh bears the image of God and that the whole man includes the flesh, will be encountered again in Irenaeus,⁽⁹⁾ but there the argument is set in the context of man's growth towards the likeness

9. See below pp. 620ff, and the refs. there. On the theory of Loofs that behind Irenaeus and 'Justin' lies a common source IQA (= Irenaeus Quelle Asia Minor) see his Theophilus von Antiochien, pp. 211 - 34.

of God as well as the image, through the gift of the Spirit. There is no idea of man's growth in the present work. Man does not, under the guidance of God and through the activity of the Word of God in salvation history, progress towards the perfect image and likeness of God.

There is, however, a clear connection between the nature of man and the Incarnation. With the hope of the resurrection of the flesh there goes a strongly anti-docetic Christology: 'There are some who say that Jesus himself appeared only as spiritual (*πνευματικὸν μόνον παρῆναι*), and not in flesh, but presented merely the appearance of flesh (*φάντασίαν σαρκός*); they attempt to rob the flesh of its promise' (ch. 2). This connection between the nature of man and Christology will also occur again in Irenaeus, but there a specific link is made between the first man of flesh and the coming of Christ in flesh whereby Christ recapitulates the first man giving him redemption.⁽¹⁰⁾ In the present work this association is not mentioned. Also, whereas in Irenaeus the Virgin birth of Christ is linked with the creation of Adam from the virgin earth,⁽¹¹⁾ here the virgin birth is described as taking place for the destruction of begetting by lawless desire, and to show that the formation of man was possible for God without human intervention (ch. 3). In other words, the possibilities of the role of Christ in the history of man's development

10. See below, pp. 615ff., 641ff., 684ff., and refs. there.

11. See below, pp. 615ff.

are not explored. Likewise the resurrection of Christ is seen by the author more as a proof of the possibility of the resurrection of the flesh than as the beginning of a new humanity.⁽¹²⁾

The material in Tatian's Oratio ad Graecos⁽¹³⁾ does not provide us with sufficient evidence from which to draw any conclusions regarding the activity of the Logos in history. The philosophical question of the relationship of the Logos to the Father is considered in some detail.⁽¹⁴⁾ The Logos is 'the first-begotten work of the Father (ἔργον πρωτότοκον τοῦ πατρὸς) . . . He came into being by participation not by abscission (γέγονεν δὲ κατὰ μερισμόν, οὐ κατὰ ἀποκοπήν)'.⁽¹⁵⁾ In this way the Father is not deprived of his power and rendered ἄλογος by the

12. De Res. 9. Cf. below on Irenaeus, pp. 657ff .

13. The work dates from the third quarter of the second century, though it is by no means certain whether it should be placed after Justin's death (c. 165 AD) and before Tatian's return to the East (c. 172/3AD), after his return to the East, or even during Justin's lifetime (i.e. before 165 AD). See e.g. M. Elze, Tatian und seine Theologie (Göttingen, 1960; = Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte, Band 9), pp. 43f. The edition used here is that by E. Schwartz, Tatiani Oratio ad Graecos (Leipzig, 1888; = TU IV/1).

14. See Elze, op. cit., pp. 76 - 79, and V.A.S. Little, The Christology of the Apologists. Doctrinal (London, 1934), pp. 181 - 87, 190 - 92.

15. Oratio 5. cf. Justin Martyr, Dial. 61 (284Bf.).

generation of the Logos. 'The Logos, begotten in the beginning, begat in turn our world, having first fashioned for himself the matter' (ch. 5). The Logos, then, is active in creation; he is also active in revelation: 'The power of the Logos, having foreknowledge of what was to happen, not as fated (οὐ καθ' εἰμαρμένην), but as the choice of free agents (τῇ δὲ τῶν αἰρουμένων αὐτεξουσίᾳ γνώμῃ), proclaimed beforehand the outcome of things in the future' (ch. 7). Tatian also discusses the role of the Logos in the creation of man.⁽¹⁶⁾ The Logos, 'in imitation of the One who begat him, made man an image of immortality (εἰκόνα τῆς ἀθανασίας), so that, as incorruption is with God, man, sharing in a part of God, might also have the immortal principle.'⁽¹⁷⁾ Man however was led astray and fell (ch. 5), but man's soul, which is not immortal of itself, is capable either of descending and dying with the flesh, or of entering into union with the divine Spirit

16. On the activity of the Logos as distinct from his being see Little, op. cit., pp. 188 - 90, and Elze, op. cit., pp. 79 - 83.

17. On Tatian's anthropology see Elze, op. cit., pp. 88 - 100.

18. Oratio 5. As Elze observes (op. cit., p. 92), from the time of Irenaeus it has been customary to distinguish between εἰκών and ὁμοίωσις from the point of view of salvation history, the εἰκών not being lost. Tatian on the other hand identifies εἰκών and ὁμοίωσις. Consequently this aspect of the salvation history which we shall see in Irenaeus is not to be found in Tatian.

as it was in the beginning, and ascending to the dwelling-place of the Spirit above.⁽¹⁹⁾ If the soul chooses to follow the Spirit the flesh too will rise with it, but not otherwise (ch. 15). There is then room for man's development, but this is not viewed historically⁽²⁰⁾ and the role of Christ is not discussed.⁽²¹⁾

After the brief comments above on the works of the Apologists that are of minor importance for our present purpose, we turn to the writings of Justin Martyr, Melito of Sardis, Theophilus of Antioch, and first of all, to the Epistle to Diognetus.

19. Oratio 13. For Tatian the soul of man is part of the πνεῦμα ὑλικόν and therefore is inseparable from the body. See Elze, op. cit., pp. 86ff. esp. pp. 88ff. On the possibility of the soul's ascending with the Spirit or descending with the flesh cf. the fate of the psychics in some Gnostic systems, see below pp. 511f.
20. There is in fact, strictly speaking, no development at all, for man is to return to his original state: 'But further, it becomes us now to seek for what we once had but have lost, to unite the soul with the Holy Spirit (ἑνωθῆναι τε τὴν ψυχὴν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ), and to strive after union with God (τὴν κατὰ Θεὸν συζυγίαν)' (Oratio 15). On this passage Elze comments: 'Die Analogie stellt sich für Tatian allerdings nicht im Rahmen einer heilsgeschichtlichen Rekapitulationstheorie dar, sondern sie besteht lediglich strukturell, und zwar darin, dass beides, Anfang und Ende der Verlorenheit, als Tat menschlicher Freiheit interpretiert wird' (op. cit., p. 93).
21. Cf. 'Für einen Erlöser ist in seinem theologischen System kein Raum, . . . Seine Lehre behandelt Gott, Welt und Mensch, wie wenn es eine philosophische Abhandlung wäre' (Elze, op. cit., p. 99).

II THE EPISTLE TO DIOGNETUS

This anonymous work⁽²²⁾ has usually been included in the collections of the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, but its subject matter gives it a better claim to consideration under the general section of the Apologists,

22. Lack of both internal and external evidence of authorship means that, as one writer has put it, 'the door of speculation thus stands open, and many have not hesitated to enter boldly in' (H.G. Meecham, The Epistle to Diognetus. The Greek Text with Introduction, Translation and Notes, Manchester, 1949, p. 16. Meecham also briefly surveys the various candidates proposed as author of the work (pp. 16ff.), but refrains, perhaps wisely, from adding to the speculation). H.I. Marrou (A Diognète, Paris, 1951; = Sources chrétiennes 33) gives a fascinating list of the dates and authors proposed up to his own day (op. cit., pp. 242f.). They range from before 70 AD to the 16th Century in respect of date, and from Apollos to Stephanus, the first editor, in respect of author. Marrou argues cogently that the upper and lower limits of date are 200 - 210 AD and 120 AD respectively (op. cit., pp. 244 - 253). For our present purpose we shall regard it simply as an anonymous work of the second century AD.

The editions used in the present study are those of Meecham and Marrou cited above. An important question to be considered is the integrity of the text. The general consensus of scholarly opinion is that chapters 11 and 12 do not belong to the same work as chapters 1 - 10, but there have been several notable scholars who have defended the integrity of the whole text. Meecham may be taken as representative of the former group and Marrou of the latter. Although the

for its themes are the superiority of Christianity to Jewish and pagan beliefs and the excellence of the christian way of life. (23)

In the Epistle to Diognetus there are some very clear references to a divine plan of salvation: (24)

For God, Master and Maker of the universe, who made all things and disposed them in their due order, proved himself not only a lover of man but also long-suffering . . . And having conceived a great and unutterable design (ἐννοία) He communicated it to His Child (παῖς) alone. And so long as He held it in a mystery (μυστήριον) and guarded His wise counsel (βουλή) He seemed to have no concern or care for us. But when He revealed it through His beloved child (διὰ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ παιδός), and manifested the things prepared from the beginning (ἐξ ἀρχῆς), He bestowed upon us all things at once, both to share in His blessings and to see and understand. (8.7 - 11).

Some of the principal elements of a pattern of Christocentric

- 22.(contd.) final chapters of the Epistle are of interest for Christology, they shed no light on Christocentric salvation history and are therefore omitted from discussion here.
23. The author himself (Ep. ad Diog. 1), proposes to consider three topics: Who is the God in whom the Christians trust; the affection the Christians have for one another; why Christianity appeared at such a late stage in man's history. The last of these in particular raises the possibility of some understanding of salvation history.
24. On the divine plan of salvation in general see, e.g., Marrou, op. cit., pp. 198 - 202.

salvation history are discernible here: the plan of man's salvation carried out by the Son and the realisation of a period of time before the Incarnation. The plan, however, is not one that is gradually worked out through history; up until the Incarnation, the plan remains a mystery.⁽²⁵⁾ History as such falls into two periods, before the Incarnation and after it; it is not a single progressive line moving towards a goal with the Incarnation simply the major turning point. Man was ignorant of God until the coming of the Son (8.1). 'No man has either seen or known Him, but God manifested Himself'.⁽²⁶⁾ Nevertheless, even if the plan of God is unknown before the Incarnation, and God Himself unknown too, this does not mean that the period before the Incarnation is without purpose:⁽²⁷⁾

'Having therefore planned (οἰκονομηκώς) everything already in His own mind (παρ' ἑαυτοῦ) with His Child (σὺν τῷ πατρὶ), He suffered us up to the former time to be borne along by unruly impulses, as we willed, in the clutches of pleasures and lusts. Not at all because He took pleasure in our sins, but out of His forbearance; not in approval of the season of iniquity which was then, but creating the season of righteousness which is now (ἀλλὰ τὸν νῦν τῆς δικαιοσύνης δημιουργῶν), so that we who in past time

25. This use of *μυστήριον* recalls Paul. Cf. Eph. 3.9; Col. 1.26; 2.2. See Meecham, op. cit., pp. 126f.

26. *Ep. ad. Diog.* 8.5. On the apparent modalism of the final phrase see below, note 30.

27. This point is central to the third of the questions proposed by the author. See esp. Marrou, op. cit., pp. 202 - 07.

were from our own deeds convicted as unworthy of life might now by the goodness of God be deemed worthy, and when we had shown clearly that of ourselves it was impossible "to enter into the kingdom of God", might be made able by the power of God' (9.1). The time, then, during which the plan of God remained a mystery was also a time of preparation; man was to learn his own inadequacy and realise the hopelessness of his condition (9.6). While the period before the Incarnation appears to men as a period of despair in which God has abandoned them, it is part of the divine purpose. God's preparations and his saving plan have been arranged from the very beginning.

Even in the creation there were signs of God's goodness, 'for God loved men for whose sake He made the world, to whom He subjected all things which are in the earth, to whom He gave reason (*λόγος*), to whom He gave mind (*νοῦς*), whom alone He permitted to look upward to Him, whom He formed after His own image (*ἐκ τῆς ἰδίας εἰκόνης*), to whom "He sent His only-begotten Son", to whom He promised the kingdom which is in heaven - and He will give it to them that have loved Him' (10.2). Man, however, had fallen into sin. The author does not describe how this came about, but man's condition is alienation from God who loves him, and man is incapable of saving himself from his predicament.

It is God's love and concern for men that motivates the coming of Christ. The Christ who comes is the Child (*παις*) or Son (*υἱός*) of God; ⁽²⁸⁾ the two titles are

virtually synonymous.⁽²⁹⁾ More important from the point of view of Christology, Christ is described as 'the very artificer and maker of the universe (τεχνίτης καὶ δημιουργὸς τῶν ὅλων) by whom He (God) created the heavens (ὃ τοὺς οὐρανοὺς ἔκτισεν)' and a long list of the creative and providential work of the Son is given (7.2). As Son of God, he is clearly subordinate to the Father, but he nevertheless shares the divine counsel (8.9; 9.1), and the Father sends him 'as a king sending a son who is a king, He sent him as God' (7.4); Christ is no mere 'servant, or an angel, or ruler, or one of those who administer the affairs of earth, or one of those entrusted with the ordering of things in heaven' (7.2). Although Christ is distinct in person from the Father and subordinate in function, he is in essence one with the Father; as 'artificer and maker of the universe' he virtually shares a title with the Father, who is elsewhere described as 'the Master and Maker of the universe' (8.7), and in his

28. παῖς (Ep. ad Diog. 8.9, 11; 9.1) and υἱός (9.2, 4; 10.2) are the main titles of Christ in the work, though he is also called 'the Saviour' (9.6) and 'the Lord' (7.7). Neither the name 'Jesus' nor the name 'Christ' occurs in the work.
29. See Marrou, *op. cit.*, pp. 186f. Meecham agrees that the words are virtual synonyms, but suggests that 'Christ as παῖς shares and reveals the Father's plan of salvation; as υἱός he is "sent" and effects it' (*op. cit.*, p. 126). Since the filial relationship of Christ to God predominates in the work Meecham prefers the translation 'Child' for παῖς to 'Servant' (*ibid.*, p. 126).

coming, Christ comes 'as God'.⁽³⁰⁾ It is the same Son of God active in creation who comes in redemption. No more precise lines are drawn between creation and redemption, and history as such, as we have already seen, is not a line of progression in one direction, but simply the period before or after the coming of Christ.

30. There are a number of statements in the work that taken in isolation would give a false impression of the work's Christology. 'For what man had any knowledge at all of what God is, before he came' (8.1) and 'God manifested Himself' (8.5) can both look like modalism, and 'Himself (God) in mercy took on him our sins' (9.2) can look like Patripassianism. The work must be treated as a whole, however, and alongside such statements as the above we must put the following: 'Himself (God) gave up His own Son as a ransom for us' (9.2, directly after the above); 'In whom was it possible for us . . . to be justified, except in the Son of God alone?' (9.4). There is in the work the lack of precision in the use of terms that is frequently found in the second century. Terms are applied to both Father and Son without any reservation, but this confusion does not mean that the author confuses the Father and the Son. In spite of the shared language it is always the Father who sends and the Son who is sent.

There is another danger on the other side if some statements are taken in isolation: the danger of subordinationism. The Son is the one 'by whom ($\hat{\omega}$ -instrumental) the Father created the heavens' (7.2), God communicates his plan 'to his Child' (8.9). Again there is also the following to be considered as well: the Father planned everything 'in His own mind with His Child' (9.1), the Son comes 'as God' (7.4), and he is superior to any angel or mere administrator of the world (7.2). See further on these points Marrou, op. cit., pp. 188 - 98, Little, op. cit., pp. 69 - 72, and Meeham, op. cit.,

When Christ comes, however, he continues to express the same loving purposes of God that have been constant from the beginning:

Did He (God) send him, as a man might conclude, to rule in tyranny and terror and awe? Not so, but in gentleness and meekness He sent him He was as it were saving when He sent him, (as) persuading, not compelling (for force is no attribute of God). When He sent him God was calling, not pursuing; He sent him as in love, not in judgement. For He will send him to be our judge, and who shall stand at his coming? (7.3 - 6).

The Son of God comes as man to men ($\omega\varsigma$ $\alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\nu$ $\pi\rho\delta\varsigma$ $\alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$)⁽³¹⁾ to persuade them back to God. Although the plan of God with regard to the salvation of man is not worked out in detail in history as events in salvation history, the period prior to the coming of Christ has fulfilled its task; man realised that he could not save himself and the season ($\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$) had come for God to manifest His goodness and power (9.2). In spite of man's

30.(contd.) pp. 23, 26 - 28.

31. Ep. ad Diog. The text has simply $\omega\varsigma$ $\pi\rho\delta\varsigma$ $\alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\xi\pi\epsilon\mu\psi\epsilon\nu$, which Marrou retains and translates 'il l'a envoyé comme il convenait qu'il le fût pour les hommes'. This, as can be seen gives to the $\omega\varsigma$ far greater significance here than it has in the preceding phrases. To avoid the difficulty and the necessity of paraphrasing, many editors follow the suggestion originally made by Lachmann that the phrase should have been $\omega\varsigma$ $\alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\nu$ $\pi\rho\delta\varsigma$. . ., the reading which Meecham adopts.

rebellion, God did not hate man or repel him, but was long-suffering and 'Himself in mercy took on Him our sins, Himself gave up His own Son as a ransom for us, the Holy One for the wicked, the innocent for the guilty, "the just for the unjust", the incorruptible for the corruptible, the immortal for mortals. For what else could cover our sins but his righteousness? In whom was it possible for us, wicked and impious as we were, to be justified, except in the Son of God alone?' (9.2 - 4). The new era has been ushered in. 'Having then convinced us in the former time (ἐν μὲν τῷ πρόσθεν χρόνῳ) of the powerlessness of our nature to gain life, and having now (νῦν δὲ) shown the Saviour in his power to save even powerless creatures, in both these ways His will was that we should believe His goodness, and regard Him as guardian, father, teacher, counsellor, healer, mind, light, honour, glory, strength, life, and have no anxiety about clothing and food' (9.6).

The divine plan in the Epistle to Diognetus is undoubtedly Christocentric; the Son is the divine agent active both in creation and in redemption, but the plan is not directly related to history in the sense of a divine purpose worked out in the successive events of man's history. History in the epistle is in two stages, before and after the Incarnation. The period before the coming of Christ is not without meaning, but it does not represent the working out of the stages of the divine plan climaxing in the events of the Incarnation and the

redemption through Christ.⁽³²⁾ The second stage, the period from the coming of Christ on, has an end in view, for Christ will come as judge (7.6), but the interest here lies not in that event as the culmination of the divine history but in the contrast between the way in which Christ may have been expected to come and will indeed come at the end, and the way in which he in fact came, in love and gentleness.

III JUSTIN MARTYR

Justin himself records how, as a young man, he followed the various philosophical schools,⁽³³⁾ but found none of them satisfying, though in Platonism he thought for a while that he had found what he was seeking. An encounter with an elderly man led Justin to examine Platonism more closely, and eventually to leave philosophy in favour of the prophets of the Old Testament and Christianity.⁽³⁴⁾ After his conversion to Christianity Justin taught for a considerable period in Rome, eventually being martyred in c. 165 AD.⁽³⁵⁾ Only three of his many works are now extant: the two Apologies and the Dialogue

32. Marrou (op. cit., pp. 204ff.) rightly contrasts the pessimistic attitude of the present work (the delay in the fulfilment of the divine plan is so that man may learn that he cannot save himself) with the optimism of the 'pédagogie divine' of Irenaeus, Origen and others, in which the unfolding of salvation history is an educative process leading in stages to the Incarnation and the proclamation of the gospel. On Irenaeus see below, pp. 619 - 97.

with Trypho the Jew.⁽³⁶⁾ His theology is characterised

33. Dial. 2 (218Cff.) 34. Dial. 3 - 8 (219Dff.)
35. The details of Justin's life are given, e.g., by E.R. Goodenough, The Theology of Justin Martyr, pp. 57 - 77, and by L.W. Barnard, Justin Martyr His Life and Thought (Cambridge, 1967), pp. 1 - 13.
36. Of all the works attributed to Justin Martyr only the two Apologies and the Dialogue with Trypho the Jew are generally considered genuine (See Goodenough, op. cit., pp. 78 - 100, and Barnard, op. cit., pp. 14 - 26). The only other work that merits serious consideration as being by Justin is the fragment on the Resurrection, which we have examined above (pp.198ff), where we rejected the Justinian authorship. The edition of the Apologies and Dialogue used here is that by Otto in S. Justini philosophi et martyris opera quae feruntur omnia edited by J.C.T. Otto, vol. 1 Opera Justini indubitata (2nd ed. Jena, 1847). Volume one part one contains the two Apologies; Volume one part two contains the Dialogue with Trypho the Jew. The translations used are those by Marcus Dods (I and II Apologia) and George Reith (Dialogus) in Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Roberts and Donaldson (edd.), vol. 2, Justin Martyr and Athenagoras (Edinburgh, 1867), though these have not been rigidly adhered to. The works are referred to by the chapter divisions of Otto and by the page and letter of the edition of Morellus printed by Otto to the right of the Greek text.

To judge from the extant works Justin was the ablest of the apologists. The ascription of the first Apology would indicate a date about 151 AD. It is possible that the second Apology is merely an appendix to the first, though Goodenough regards it as a fragment of a larger work (See Goodenough, op. cit., pp. 84 - 87, for a discussion of the relevant points).

by, on the one hand, 'unreserved attachment to the Christian doctrinal tradition' and on the other hand, the 'intention to appropriate, on behalf of Christianity, the occasional truths found by the philosophers'.⁽³⁷⁾

In order to understand Justin's appreciation of history, and subsequently his appreciation of the role of Christ in salvation history, we shall first examine his attitude to the history of Israel.⁽³⁸⁾ In his lengthy discussion with Trypho, Justin is at pains to show that

- 36.(contd.) The Dialogue with Trypho the Jew is set c. 135 AD (Trypho describes himself as a fugitive from the Jewish war - Dial. 1(217D)), but since the work refers to the first Apology, it is usually dated c. 160 (cf. F.L. Cross, The Early Christian Fathers, p. 51). Whether or not a real discussion lies behind the work is difficult to determine. Barnard (op. cit., pp. 23f.) accepts that there was an original historical debate which Justin later elaborated. Goodenough (op. cit., pp. 90f.) takes a much more sceptical view. From the fact that in the Dialogue the Jews concede the double parousia of Christ, the worship of Christ as God, his suffering and his Name, and even the virgin birth and balk only at the crucifixion, E. Sjöberg concludes that the Dialogue is a work of literary fiction (E. Sjöberg, Exkurs I 'Justin und das Problem vom leidenden Messias im Judentum', in Der verborgene Menschensohn in den Evangelien (Lund, 1955), pp. 247 - 54). The work is very discursive and ranges over many subjects and does not lend itself to ready analysis of its structure.
37. R. Holte, 'Logos Spermatikos. Christianity and Ancient Philosophy according to St. Justin's Apologies', in Studia Theologica 12(1958), pp. 109 - 68, quotation from p. 112.

the benefits bestowed on Israel by God have been transferred to the Christians.⁽³⁹⁾ Justin has no wish to deny the truth of the promises made by God to Israel, but at the same time he is certain that it is the Christians who shall enjoy the promises and not the Jews. As a result, we find the same double attitude to the Jewish history as we saw in e.g. the Epistle of Barnabas.⁽⁴⁰⁾ The promises were made through Abraham and the patriarchs and prophets, but their genuine descendants are those who have faith in Christ and this means, above all, the Gentiles.⁽⁴¹⁾ As a nation, the Jews are rejected; they are 'children in whom is no faith',⁽⁴²⁾ but of the Christians Justin says: 'along with Abraham we shall inherit the holy land, when we shall receive the inheritance for an endless eternity, being children of Abraham through the like faith.'⁽⁴³⁾ The inheritance does not go to the descendants of Abraham after the flesh.⁽⁴⁴⁾ The same argument is developed in relation to the patriarchs Isaac and Jacob.⁽⁴⁵⁾

38. On this see especially P. Richardson, Israel in the Apostolic Church, pp. 9 - 14.

39. Dial. 82 (308B); 135 (365B). Justin is in fact the first to describe the Church explicitly as 'Israel'. See P. Richardson, op. cit., pp. 1, 9 etc.

40. See above, pp. 109ff.

41. Dial. 26 (243C).

42. Dial. 119 (348A).

43. Dial. 119 (347D).

44. Dial. 140 (369C).

45. Dial. 120 (348A,B).

As a corollary of the transfer of the promises from Israel to the Church, the history of Israel takes on the character of a preparatory episode. The events of Israel's history become the type of the events of the life of Christ and the establishing of the Church. Justin in no way denies the truth of the activity of God in Israel's history on Israel's behalf, but he sees it as significant not primarily for itself but for the future acts of God in Christ and the Church. But it is important to note that Justin does not see the significance of the divine events in Israel's history solely in their relevance to Christ and the redemption he brought. The events of Israel's history are also important in themselves, but the importance is only temporary; with the coming of Christ in the Incarnation their importance disappears. What this means is that Justin sees the history of Israel as indeed salvation history and not simply a typological foreshadowing of future events which alone have any saving significance.

The saving significance of the events of Israel's history can be seen in Justin's consideration of the Exodus. Justin challenges Trypho to admit that the Christians are 'more faithful to God than you, who were redeemed from Egypt with a high hand and a visitation of great glory.'⁽⁴⁶⁾ Justin comments on the other episodes of the Exodus and at several points sees typological signs

46. Dial. 131 (360C).

of the redemption through Christ, and he says: 'Although God anticipated before the proper times all the mysteries (μυστήρια), in order to show favour (χαρίσασθαι) to you, you are convicted of being always thankless towards him.'⁽⁴⁷⁾

The saving activity of God is not denied; what is emphasised is Israel's rebelliousness.⁽⁴⁸⁾

In the typology itself the same points can be made. Justin discusses the similarities between Joshua and Jesus.⁽⁴⁹⁾ Both lead their people into the holy land and distribute it to each one, 'though not in the same manner. For the former gave them a temporary inheritance (ὁ μὲν γὰρ πρόσκαιρον ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς τὴν κληρονομίαν), seeing he was neither Christ who is God, nor the Son of God; but the latter, after the holy resurrection, shall give us the eternal possession (αἰώνιον ἡμῖν τὴν κατέσχεσιν)'.⁽⁵⁰⁾ The details of Justin's typological exegesis do not concern us here, but it is clear that he never denies the validity of God's saving activity on Israel's behalf. As a result of the fulfilment of the type in Christ, the type itself must be seen as of temporary value but not as of no value in itself.

The fact that the promises made to the patriarchs are

47. Dial. 131 (361A).

48. Cf. Dial. 133 (362C - 363D).

49. The force of the argument, which depends on the fact that Joshua and Jesus are in fact identical names, cannot be represented in English.

50. Dial. 113 (340C).

fulfilled to the Church and not to the Jews means that Justin can continue to stress both the validity of the promise and its fulfilment, and at the same time draw a sharp distinction between the practices of the Jews and the customs of the Church. The Jewish activities from which Justin wishes to dissociate the Church are regarded as the outworn type that has found its spiritual fulfilment in the practices of the Church. So with regard to the Law Justin tells Trypho, 'The law promulgated on Horeb is now old, and belongs to yourselves alone; but this is for all without reserve. Now a law set against a law abrogates the one before it, and a covenant which comes after, likewise puts an end to the previous one; and an eternal and final law - namely, Christ - has been given to us, and the trustworthy covenant, after which there shall be no law, no commandment, no ordinance.'⁽⁵¹⁾ Once again Justin does not proceed to argue on the basis of what has just been said that the law was without purpose in God's plan. Circumcision began with Abraham and the Sabbath, sacrifices, offerings and feasts with Moses 'on account of the hardness of your people's heart',⁽⁵²⁾ and for that very reason 'it was necessary, in accordance with the Father's will (κατὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς βουλήν), that they should cease in Him who was born of a virgin of the family of Abraham and tribe of Judah, and of David; in

51. Dial. 11 (228B).

52. Dial. 43 (261B). Cf. Dial. 27 (244C), 47 (266B).

Christ the Son of God, who was proclaimed to all the world as about to come to be the eternal law and the new covenant (αἰώνιος νόμος καὶ καινὴ διαθήκη).⁽⁵³⁾ The old law is valid but temporary. The old circumcision on the eighth day was given as a type of the new circumcision from deceit and iniquity through him who rose on the eighth day.⁽⁵⁴⁾ Circumcision was given as a sign not as a work of righteousness,⁽⁵⁵⁾ and Justin even interprets it as a sign that the Jews are marked out for suffering for having slain the Just One and his prophets before him.⁽⁵⁶⁾

The history of Israel is seen by Justin, therefore, as genuine salvation history, but in view of the definitive divine act in Christ the history of Israel can have no more than preparatory value, leading up to and foreshadowing the more important events to come. When, however, Justin considers Noah as a type of the salvation to come, he looks beyond mere Jewish history and sees a type of universal significance. Noah and those who were with him, 'being eight in number, were a symbol of the eighth day, on which our Christ appeared when He rose from the dead, the day for ever the first in power. For Christ, being the first-born of all creation, became again the beginning (ἀρχή) of another race regenerated by Him through water, and faith, and wood, which holds the mystery of the cross; just as Noah was saved by wood when he rode over the waters

53. Dial. 43 (261C).

54. Dial. 41 (260C).

55. Dial. 137 (366D).

56. Dial. 16 (234A).

with his household.⁽⁵⁷⁾ This, argues Justin, applies not simply to the Jews or their land, but to all men, for the whole earth was inundated.⁽⁵⁸⁾

Having seen the seriousness with which Justin takes the activity of God in history, we may now ask what is the role of Christ in salvation history and how far history is seen as the gradual unfolding of the divine plan of man's salvation. We shall trace the activity of Christ from creation to consummation and this will provide us with what evidence there is in Justin for understanding salvation history not only as the work of God in history, but as the unfolding of the divine purpose. As a preliminary to the study of the work of Christ in history we shall say something about Justin's Logos-doctrine and the relation of Christ to the Father, and, in considering the Incarnation, something about the strictly christological problems of the relation of the divine and human in Christ.

On the question of the relationship between Christ and God we may be brief since this is not directly related to salvation history. However something must be said about it if we are to grasp Justin's understanding of the one who carries out the work of salvation.

Justin's Christology stems from the ineffability of God. The Father and Lord of all is very highly exalted,

57. Dial. 138 (367C,D).

58. Dial. 138 (368A).

he does not appear in any place, he does not walk, sleep or rise up, but remains in his own place, seeing but unseen.⁽⁵⁹⁾ He is unbegotten, and furthermore no name is given to him, for the giving of a name implies one who is older to give it, and hence the words 'Father', 'God', 'Lord', 'Creator' and so on are not names at all but appellations that refer to God's good deeds and functions.⁽⁶⁰⁾ Above all it is impossible for the Father of all to be manifested on earth.⁽⁶¹⁾ The Father and Lord of all is transcendent.⁽⁶²⁾

59. Dial. 127 (356D, 357A).

60. II Ap. 6 (44D). Cf. Ev. Ver. 38.28 - 40.2; ApocryJn II 3.15 - 17.

61. Dial. 56 (275A), 60 (283B).

62. The transcendence of God was a commonplace of second century thought. Although it provides the starting point for Justin's christology, transcendence alone is not adequate to describe God in Justin's theology. While on the one hand Justin emphasises God's transcendence, on the other hand he sees God as the creator and sustainer of all things and also as the merciful Father. This complex understanding of God Goodenough traces to the milieu of Hellenistic Judaism in which Philo was the most notable figure (op. cit., pp. 123 - 38). Barnard (op. cit., 75 - 84) rejects this and sees in Justin's thought on God two converging conceptions of the Deity, the biblical conception of God as creator and Father and the Middle Platonist conception of God as the transcendent Cause remote from the world. It is in any case, says Barnard, on Middle Platonism that the Hellenistic Judaism represented by Philo was itself dependent. On the close similarities in the conception of the transcendence of God between Philo, Middle Platonism,

The transcendence of God lays the foundation for Justin's understanding of the person of Christ in relation to God, for the very transcendence of God compels Justin to admit the existence of an intermediary between God and man.⁽⁶³⁾ The theophanies of the Old Testament would be expected to pose a problem for Justin in this respect, but in a bold move he uses these very theophanies to prove that the God who is manifested in them is not the Father of all but 'another God and Lord subject to (ὁπρό) the Maker of all things'.⁽⁶⁴⁾ This 'second' God is the Son, and Justin argues at length for the real distinctions between Father and Son, relying on his exegesis of the appearance of God to Abraham at Mamre and the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah.⁽⁶⁵⁾ The subject of the theophanies

62.(contd.) Gnosticism, Clement of Alexandria and Neoplatonism, similarities repeated at several points in Justin, see S.R.C. Lilla, Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian Platonism and Gnosticism (Oxford, 1971), esp. pp. 212 - 26.

63. Cf. J.Barbel, Christos Angelos, pp. 37 - 46.

64. Dial. 56 (275C). The clear subordination of ὁπρό led some editors to emend the text. 'Υπρό, read by the codices is to be retained; see Otto, ad loc.

65. Dial. 56 (275A - 279B); cf. Dial. 127 (356D - 357D). Goodenough finds the closest parallels to Justin's method of arguing in the work of Philo (Goodenough, op. cit., pp. 143 - 45), but points out that Justin has given to the proof of the existence of a second personal God 'an implication never found in any Judaism, and in deducing therefrom a second divine Personality has come to conclusions which Jews have always felt to be unjustified' (ibid., p. 145). See also H. Hegermann,

is a second God distinct 'numerically but not in will
 (ἀριθμῶ ἀλλ' οὐ γνῶμῃ)' from the Maker of all things.⁽⁶⁶⁾
 Justin also appeals to the plurals in Gen. 1.26, 'Let us
 make . . . ' and Gen. 3.22, 'Man has become like us',⁽⁶⁷⁾
 and also to Prov. 8.22, 'The Lord made me the beginning of
 his ways for his works.'⁽⁶⁸⁾ All of these show the reality
 of the distinctions, and the fact that the Father holds a
 rational conversation with the Son further shows that the
 distinction is a real personal one.⁽⁶⁹⁾ The distinction of

65. (contd.) Die Vorstellung vom Schöpfungsmittler im
 hellenistischen Judentum und Urchristentum (Berlin
 1961; = TU 82), esp. pp. 67 - 87; who emphasises the
 similarities, but also notes the real differences
 between Philo and Justin.

66. Dial. 56 (276D).

67. Dial. 62 (285A - 286B).

68. Dial. 61 (284C - 285A); Cf. Dial. 129 (359Af.).

69. Dial. 62 (285C). Cf. Dial. 128 (358A - C) and Justin's
 description of the Son as λογικός, Dial. 61 (284A),
 62 (285C), to which the following comment is apposite:
 'Logos considered as simply a faculty of the Divine
 Mind could be said, perhaps, to be "present with" the
 Father, but personal Being is definitely asserted when
 the Logos is of such nature and character that He can
 co-operate with the Creator and the Creator can
 commune with Him' (Little, op. cit., p. 119).

70. See Dial. 61 (284A, B).

71. See Dial. 61 (284B,C). Cf. Tatian, Oratio 5; Dial.
 128 (358C), 129 (358D). The way in which Justin steers
 his precarious course between the various pitfalls of
 the images he employs has been well demonstrated by
 Goodenough (op. cit., pp. 147 - 53) and by Lebreton
 (op. cit., pp. 443 - 49).

the son from the Father in no way undermines the Son's true divinity however,⁽⁷⁰⁾ and Justin uses the ambiguities of the word *λόγος* and the analogy of lighting one fire from another to show that the Father can beget the Son as distinct from himself, without in any way losing anything of his essential nature.⁽⁷¹⁾ The Son is truly divine, but subordinate to his Father.⁽⁷²⁾ All this provides the necessary background to an appreciation of the one who is

72. Dial. 61 (284B); II Ap. 6 (44D,E); Dial. 126 (356B), 129 (359B). As Goodenough points out (op. cit., pp. 155f.), when Justin states that the Word is distinct numerically, but not in will (*γνώμη*) (Dial. 56 (276D)), this does not imply any equality between the Father and the Word, for *γνώμη* means not simply 'will' but 'intellectual initiative'. The Word is a distinct personality but has 'no impulsive power in his thinking'. On the whole question of the subordination of the Word in Justin see A.L. Feder, Justins des Märtyrers Lehre von Jesus Christus, dem Messias und dem menschgewordenen Sohne Gottes. Eine dogmengeschichtliche Monographie (Freiburg i. B., 1906), pp. 103 - 19. Feder points out that there are differing degrees of subordination. The Son may be subordinate in nature (cf. Arianism), or he may be divine, but in a restricted sense of similarity (cf. Semi-Arianism), or there may be identity of nature but dependence of the Son on the Father. Justin completely rejects subordination in its first form, but Feder points to various features of Justin's thought that indicate signs of both the other kinds of subordination. At the same time he rightly observes that Justin was under no necessity to prove the *ὁμοούσιον* of the son. Feder concludes that Justin holds 'Subordinationismus des Sohnes unter den Vater, ohne der logischen Konsequenz' (op. cit., p. 119).

active in salvation history; it is this 'second God' who is active in salvation history.

Since salvation history is concerned with movement and the succession of events we may ask here whether Justin traces any movement back to the begetting of the Son by the Father. Does history begin, so to speak, in God? There is only one passage that has been used to provide a clue to Justin's thinking on this: 'And his Son, who alone is properly called Son, the Word, who also was with him and was begotten before the works (ὁ λόγος πρὸ τῶν ποιημάτων καὶ συνὼν καὶ γεννώμενος), when in the beginning He created and arranged all things by him (ὅτε τὴν ἀρχὴν δι' αὐτοῦ πάντα ἔκτισε καὶ ἐκόσμησε), is called Christ . . . (73) The Word both was with God and was begotten.

Did Justin distinguish here between two stages of the existence of the Word? Was Justin thinking of the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος and the λόγος προφορικός? Such an interpretation of the passage⁽⁷⁴⁾ demands taking the clause ὅτε τὴν ἀρχὴν etc. as modifying only γεννώμενος and not both συνὼν and γεννώμενος. This does some violence to the text which, through the double καί, clearly links

73. II Ap. 6 (44D,E).

74. So Otto ad loc.; also K.G. Semisch, Justin Martyr: his Life, Writings and Opinions (ET, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1843; = The Biblical Cabinet 41 and 42), vol. II p. 181, and H.A. Wolfson, The Philosophy of the Church Fathers, vol. I, Faith, Trinity, Incarnation (Cambridge, Mass., 1956), pp. 192f.

both *συνών* and *γεννώμενος* with what follows. The text states no more than that 'when God created the world the Logos was already in existence and dwelling with Him, and was of assistance in the process of creation.'⁽⁷⁵⁾ The generation of the Son is closely linked with the work of creation, but beyond that Justin's speculation does not go.⁽⁷⁶⁾ Furthermore to interpret *συνών* as meaning 'being present within the Father as the Father's attribute or faculty' ignores the usual meaning of *συνεῖναι*, which is of persons in social contact.⁽⁷⁷⁾

This Son who is begotten from the Father of all is also the Word of God, and we must now briefly consider Justin's Logos-doctrine.⁽⁷⁸⁾ One thing must be stated at

75. Goodenough, op. cit., p. 154. Cf. Lebreton, op. cit., pp. 449f.

76. Cf. 'Affirme-t-il (sc. Justin) par là l'éternité du Verbe? On ne peut pas le dire; le Verbe est, pour lui, certainement antérieur à toutes les créatures, à tous les temps; il répète souvent cette affirmation; mais, tout en affirmant cette préexistence, il n'en scrute point le mystère' (Lebreton, op. cit., p. 460).

77. See Little, op. cit., pp. 125 - 28.

78. The background to Justin's use of the Logos-concept (On the *λόγος σπερματικός* see below, note 83) is on the one hand biblical and on the other hand philosophical. There are a number of opinions as to the precise philosophical background to Justin's use of the idea. Some scholars have noted the similarities between Justin and Philo. Goodenough (op. cit., pp. 139 - 75, esp. pp. 168 - 73) argues that the background is to be found in the Philonic tradition; Wolfson (op. cit., esp. pp. 177 - 286) even suggests literary

the outset; Justin uses the philosophical concept of the Logos to interpret the person of Christ, and not vice versa. The starting point for Justin's thinking is the person of Jesus Christ and not the philosophical idea. Hence the Logos in Justin's theology is, above all, a personality.⁽⁷⁹⁾ Much of what we have said above in respect of the Son can be repeated in respect of the Logos. He is 'the first-birth of God (πρῶτον γέννημα τοῦ Θεοῦ)',⁽⁸⁰⁾ he is 'the first power after God the Father and Lord of all, and Son',⁽⁸¹⁾ and Justin also says: 'Next to God (μετὰ τὸν Θεόν), we worship and love the Word who is from the Unbegotten and Ineffable God.'⁽⁸²⁾ In the Dialogue with Trypho the Jew Justin's interest in the Logos is focused on him as the God who was manifested in the Old Testament theophanies; in the Apologies his

78.(contd.) dependence on Philo himself. This is almost certainly going too far (see Hegermann, op. cit., p. 77 and Barnard, Justin Martyr, pp. 92 - 96, who links Justin with the Hellenistic-Jewish influence of the Wisdom Literature) and in the recent study by C. Andresen ('Justin und der mittlere Platonismus', in ZNTW 44 (1952-53), pp. 157 - 95; cf. Lilla, op. cit., pp. 21 - 27) a strong case is made for Middle Platonism as the probable philosophical background of Justin's Logos-doctrine.

79. The point is emphasised by Barnard (Justin Martyr, pp. 91f.), Goodenough (op. cit., pp. 174f.) and Feder (op. cit., pp. 153f.).

80. I Ap. 21 (66E).

81. I Ap. 32 (74B).

82. II Ap. 13 (51C,D); cf. I Ap. 12 (59E).

interest is mainly in the philosophical doctrine of the logos. It is of course, for Justin, the same Word of God about whom he is speaking in both cases, but his manner of speaking is varied to suit the occasion.⁽⁸³⁾ Christ, 'the first-born of God (πρωτότοκος τοῦ Θεοῦ)', is none other than 'the Word in whom every race of men shared (λόγον ὄντα, οὗ πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων μετέσχε); and those who lived reasonably (μετὰ λόγου) are Christians, even though they have been thought atheists.'⁽⁸⁴⁾ When he considers the subject of persecution, Justin points out that the Stoics were hated since they were admirable in respect of their moral teaching 'on account of the seed

83. No attempt will be made here to give more than a brief comment on Justin's teaching about the λόγος σπερματικός and its background. In the original Stoic doctrine from which it developed, λόγος σπερματικός is a material concept and above all an impersonal concept (see, e.g., Goodenough, op. cit., pp. 16ff., 161f.; M. Spanneut, op. cit., pp. 316 - 19). It is in this impersonal sense that Goodenough interprets the λόγος σπερματικός in Justin (op. cit., pp. 162 - 67). This places Justin in the Philonic tradition; but the very fact that outside of the λόγος σπερματικός the Word in Justin is intensely personal through the identification with Christ raises a number of difficulties, not to say contradictions (see, e.g., Lebreton, op. cit., pp. 434 - 39; Goodenough, op. cit., pp. 165f., 214f.). The ultimate origin of the doctrine is Stoicism, but Justin has probably inherited it from a number of sources (see particularly the comments of Holte (art. cit.) on the views of Andresen (art. cit.) that Justin derived the concept from Middle Platonism, and cf. Lilla, op. cit., p. 24, n. 3).

84. I Ap. 46 (83C).

of the logos implanted in every race of men (διὰ τὸ
ἐμφυτον παντὶ γένει ἀνθρώπων σπέρμα τοῦ λόγου)⁽⁸⁵⁾

All men therefore possess a seed of the divine Word. What exactly does this mean, for we have here a suggestion of the Word's universal activity - perhaps even universal activity in history?

Justin's precise meaning is difficult to determine. The problem centres on the fact that sometimes Justin speaks of a seed or a part of the Logos of which men partake,⁽⁸⁶⁾ sometimes of the Logos in which men share.⁽⁸⁷⁾ If the second is taken at its face value, the result is a kind of emanationism or pantheism in which men share in the being of the Logos.⁽⁸⁸⁾ If the emphasis is put on the seed then a careful distinction can be drawn between Christ the Word and the seed in man.⁽⁸⁹⁾ But whichever approach is taken some passages leave problems.⁽⁹⁰⁾ An interesting solution has been advanced by R. Holte.⁽⁹¹⁾ In his opinion σπέρμα τοῦ λόγου and λόγος σπερματικός are not identical concepts. The Spermatic Word is the Word who sows seeds of

85. II Ap. 8 (46B,C).

86. II Ap. 8 (46B,C; 46C,D), 10 (48C), 13 (51C; 51D).

87. I Ap. 46 (83C); II Ap. 10 (48E; 49A).

88. So Goodenough, op. cit., pp. 214f. Cf. Andresen, art. cit., pp. 174 - 77.

89. So Feder, op. cit., pp. 124ff.

90. See Holte, art. cit., pp. 109 - 16, for further references.

91. Art. cit.

knowledge; on the other hand, the seed of the Word is identical with *μέρος, μέθεξις, μίμημα, συγγενὲς τοῦ λόγου*, all of which are to be understood in the Platonic sense of *μέθεξις*, so that to have part of the Word is not to share in the Word's being, but to have an analogous copy, a reflection of the Word. Hence Greek philosophy can never proceed beyond an analogous knowledge of the truth. However, the concept of the *λόγος σπερματικός* does enable Justin to look with favour on much that was taught by the Greek philosophers. Christ was partially known to Socrates, 'for he (Christ) was and is the Word who is in every man.'⁽⁹²⁾ The teachings of Plato are not different from those of Christ, 'for each man spoke well, according to his share in the divine Logos, the Sower (of knowledge) (*ἀπὸ μέρους τοῦ σπερματικοῦ θείου λόγου*), seeing what is related to it (*τὸ συγγενὲς ὁρῶν*).'⁽⁹³⁾

Faced with those passages where it clearly states that men share in the Word, Holte refers this to the fact that in Middle Platonism and Philo the Logos can be

92. II Ap. 10 (48E, 49A).

93. II Ap. 13 (51C); cf. II Ap. 10 (48C). Holte maintains (art. cit., p. 147, pp. 149ff.) that *ἀπὸ μέρους* is an adverbial phrase meaning 'partially', and the genitival phrase *τοῦ σπερματικοῦ θείου λόγου* is dependent on *τὸ συγγενὲς*, which is itself another equivalent of *μέθεξις*, but cf. Lilla, op. cit., p. 25.

94. II Ap. 8 (46 C,D).

regarded as present in all men in the sense that He is active in enlightening them without being the object of their knowledge. Christ the Word, therefore, created all human truth, but without the Incarnation that truth is only a *μέθεξις*. The Incarnation is necessary and the Church alone possesses the truth. Thus, the Stoics were hated, but they are even more hated 'who do not live according to only a part of the Spermatic Word, but by knowledge and contemplation of the whole Word, which is Christ.' (94)

If the concept of the *λόγος σπέρματικός* enables Justin to approve of the writings of the Greek philosophers, the fact that they had in this way only a partial or analogous knowledge of the Word of God enables him to account for the contradictions and to avoid approving their works in toto. (95) 'Since they did not know the whole of the Word (*πάντα τὰ τοῦ λόγου*), which is Christ, they often contradicted themselves.' (96) Justin draws a very careful distinction between the seed of the word in every man which is given according to each man's capacity, and the Word of God 'of which there is the participation and

95. The statement that 'those who lived reasonably are Christians' (I Ap. 46 (83C), among whom the Greek philosophers are included, is strictly qualified.

96. II Ap. 10 (48C); cf. II Ap. 13 (51D).

97. II Ap. 13 (51D,E).

98. I Ap. 32 (74B).

imitation according to the grace which is from Him'.⁽⁹⁷⁾ The whole Word is Christ, the Son of God, who took flesh and became man.⁽⁹⁸⁾ The λόγος σπερματικός and the Word who becomes incarnate are one and the same, of course, but the whole truth cannot be gained from man's relationship to the λόγος σπερματικός alone. Not only did the Greek philosophers have only a partial knowledge of the Word, they took the major part of their doctrines from Moses and the prophets, 'for Moses is more ancient than all the Greek writers'.⁽⁹⁹⁾ This explains why there seem to be seeds of truth among all men, though when they contradict Scripture the fault lies with their lack of understanding.⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ So, maintains Justin, 'it is not that we hold the same opinions as others, but that all speak in imitation of ours.',⁽¹⁰¹⁾

Is it right to interpret the doctrine of the λόγος σπερματικός as a sign of Justin's interest in the universality of the Word's activity in human history?⁽¹⁰²⁾ The universality is not in question, but the word 'history' requires qualification. Used to mean simply 'human affairs' its use is justified; but there is no evidence that Justin was here interested in history as a process

99. I Ap. 44 (81E).

100. I Ap. 44 (82A).

101. I Ap. 60 (93C).

102. See e.g., Little, op. cit., pp. 124 - 36, and, above all, B. Seeberg, 'Die Geschichtstheologie Justins des Märtyrers', in ZKG 58(1939), pp. 1 - 81.

of movement towards a goal. The λόγος σπερματικός is contrasted with the whole Logos who is Christ, but the bestowing of the word as a seed in all men is not understood as a foretaste or instalment that looks to the Incarnation for its fulfilment.

When we turn to a consideration of creation we see that God the Father is described as 'The Maker of all things',⁽¹⁰³⁾ but the work of creation is carried out by the Son.⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ There is no contradiction in this. Justin is not interested in the rigid apportioning of tasks in the divine economy. The Father and Son are distinct numerically as we have seen, but the Father always remains the source both of the Son's being and his activity. The Son's work is strictly a work of fashioning rather than creating, for he works with unformed matter.⁽¹⁰⁵⁾ It is to be noted that the role of the Son in the events associated with creation and the fall of man does not go beyond the simple statement that the creation took place through him.⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ There is no hint in Justin of the idea found in Irenaeus that the Word represents the image of God after which man is made.⁽¹⁰⁷⁾ Consequently, the

103. Dial. 56 (275C), etc. 104. II Ap. 6 (44D,E).

105. II Ap. 10 (58B); I Ap. 59 (92C - E). It should be noted that Justin does not go on to say that matter is eternal. See Goodenough, op. cit., pp. 209f., Barnard, op. cit., pp. 111ff.

106. It is to be noted that Justin does not attribute the work of providence to the Word; see Lebreton, op. cit., p. 463.

107. See below, pp. 582ff.

close connection between the creation of man and the Incarnation as two episodes in the history of man's development that reaches from creation to the consummation is not found in Justin. On the other hand, G. Andresen has argued that creation marks the beginning of salvation history.⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ His case rests on two points: Justin states that the predictions of Christ's incarnation date back for 5,000 years,⁽¹⁰⁹⁾ by which is probably meant, back to creation.⁽¹¹⁰⁾ These statements, maintains Andresen, have 'their religious pre-supposition in a historical understanding of revelation'.⁽¹¹¹⁾ The second point is that Christ as the *ἀρχή* 'stands, through his act of creation, at the beginning of world-history'.⁽¹¹²⁾ In both points Andresen is correct, but he goes on to use these as part of a total concept of salvation history in Justin, from creation to consummation. Against this we may observe that Justin never associates Christ as *ἀρχή* with anything other than creation; he is simply the beginning for creation and Justin shows no interest at this point in what follows after creation.

We have already seen that the theophanies of the Old Testament were manifestations of the Word of God. The

108. Logos und Nomos. Die Polemik des Kelsos wider das Christentum (Berlin, 1955; = Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 30), pp. 314f.

109. I Ap. 31 (73B).

110. Andresen, op. cit., pp. 314f.

111. *ibid.*, p. 315

112. *ibid.*, p. 315.

activity of God on Israel's behalf is, by the same token, the activity of the Word of God; it was Jesus who led the Fathers of Israel out of Egypt and into the promised land. (113) Apart from the theophanies, and the salvation history, the Word is also active in the work of revelation to the prophets. 'The prophets are inspired (θεοφοροῦνται) by no other than the divine Word (λόγῳ θεῷ)'. (114)

The divine Word is the source of the prophetic inspiration; Christ is the content of much of the prophecy. In the Old Testament Justin finds innumerable signs of the foretelling of the events of Christ's life, of the person of Christ, of the redemption achieved by him, and of the whole christian dispensation. The details of Justin's exegesis do not matter here. What must be asked is this: Is it possible to regard the activity of the Word in revelation as taking place within a pattern of salvation history? We have already seen that the events of Israel's history are seen as salvation history in which Jesus is active, but Justin's interest in the theophanies does not lie in this direction, but in their value as evidence for the distinctions in the Godhead. (115) Of the work of

113. Dial. 120 (348C), 75 (300C - 301A).

114. I Ap. 33 (75D); cf. I Ap. 35 - 39 (76A - 78C); Dial. 7 (224D).

115. The fact that Justin uses the theophanies as proofs for the existence of a second God reduces their significance for Andresen's case that they form part of Justin's theology of history (op. cit., pp. 315f.).

revelation to the prophets we can say no more than that it takes place during the period of the old covenant; it scarcely qualifies as salvation history. The prophecies of Christ take their significance in the main from the future events to which they point and have therefore no saving significance apart from that. Nevertheless, Justin does ask: 'For with what reason should we believe of a crucified man that he is the first-born of the unbegotten God, and himself will pass judgement on the whole human race, unless we had found testimonies concerning him published before he came and was born as man?'⁽¹¹⁶⁾ In short the importance of the prophecy is not exhausted by the fact that it refers to Christ; it is also important that it is delivered before the event to which it refers takes place. In this way the prophecy itself, as prophecy, has its place in God's plan of salvation, for its priority in time leads to belief in the events to which it points.

In accordance with all that had been prophesied beforehand the Word becomes incarnate. This takes place, Justin insists, 'according to the will of God the Father'.⁽¹¹⁷⁾ Here for the first time in Justin we have expression of the idea that an event takes place in fulfilment of God's purpose. The prophecies relating to Christ express God's

116. I Ap. 53 (88A).

117. II Ap. 6 (45A); cf. I Ap. 23 (68C), 46 (83E), 63 (96A); Dial. 48 (267C).

intention but neither they nor the theophanies of the Old Testament nor even the events of Israel's history occur as the stated working out of the divine will. Even with the Incarnation, however, care must be taken, for it is not the event as an event in history that Justin sees as taking place in accordance with the divine will, but the fact of the Incarnation as expressing the divine will. The progressive unfolding of events as stages of a salvation history that expresses the divine purpose does not appear to interest Justin. Even the fact, of vital importance to Justin, that Christ fulfills the hopes and expectations of the Old Testament is not seen as the historical outcome of God's purpose in history. Justin is aware of the type and the reality but not of the historical progression from the one to the other as a divinely ordered movement of history. This is to some extent borne out by the fact that, having said that the Incarnation fulfills the will of God, he only twice in his extant writings outlines the purpose of the Incarnation. 'Christ, Son of God, was before the morning star and the moon, and submitted to become incarnate, and be born of this virgin of the family of David, in order that by this dispensation (*διὰ τῆς οἰκονομίας ταύτης*), the serpent that sinned from the beginning, and the angels like him, may be destroyed, and that death may be despised, . . .'(118)

118. Dial. 45 (264A). Of the eleven references to *οἰκονομία* in Justin, seven refer to Christ: to his Incarnation (Dial. 45 (264A), 120 (348A,B)), to his suffering on the cross (Dial. 30 (247D), 31 (247D), 103 (331A)) or to his life in general (Dial. 67 (291D), 87 (315A)). In

The second passage is similar: 'He became man by the virgin, in order that the disobedience which proceeded from the

118. (contd.) this context the meaning of the word is 'the divine administration of things' and specifically God's act of salvation in Christ. It is always God's dispensation, which Christ fulfils by his Incarnation, life and death. Does Justin include in this *οἰκονομία* the idea of a divine ordering of events according to an overall plan of history? In the references to Christ there is no suggestion that these things happen as the fulfilment of any historical plan; they are divinely decreed, but that is not the same thing. In one of the remaining instances there is no possible reference to a historical plan. Justin speaks of the *οἰκονομία* of the gourd that protected Jonah (Dial. 107 (334D)); but here the reference is solely to God's care for Jonah in providing the plant. In the remaining passages the polygamy of the patriarchs is referred to: 'Certain dispensations of weighty mysteries (*οἰκονομίαι τινὲς μεγάλων μυστηρίων*) were accomplished in each act of this sort. For in the marriages of Jacob I shall mention what dispensation and prophecy (*οἰκονομία καὶ προκλήρυξις*) were accomplished' (Dial. 134 (364A); cf. Dial. 141 (371A)). Justin's concern is to see truth in the Old Testament narratives without condoning fornication. David's repentance of his adultery, therefore, becomes a universal sign of repentance (Dial. 141 (370C - 371B)), and Jacob's bigamy a sign of the division between the synagogue and the Church brought about through Christ (Dial. 134 (364B - D)). There is no doubt that Justin regards these acts as signs of the divine administration and of prophecy, but David's act is not related to the saving acts of God in history, but to repentance, and in the remaining case the emphasis lies on the typological parallels rather than on the historical line between type and fulfilment. It is in any case far too slender a base on which to build in

serpent might receive its destruction in the same manner in which it derived its origin.' (119) The passage will be discussed below (p. 254) but here it should be noted that this parallel between creation and Incarnation is significant mainly for the comparison of the two women and not for any theory of a necessary link between creation and Incarnation. That this is so is borne out by the fact that there is no mention at all of the more important comparison between Adam and Christ, so important for Irenaeus.

There is never any doubt in Justin's mind about the real divinity of the incarnate Christ. It is the same Son of God, the same Word of God, who was begotten of God before all ages, the same divine Word active in the theophanies who has now become man. (120) Furthermore it is not the *λόγος* *σπερματικός* accessible, if only by analogy, to all men, but the whole Logos. (121) The paradox of the Word-become-flesh is left to stand as a paradox. The Word does not simply assume flesh, or take on manhood, he becomes man. (122) The problems raised by the paradox of Christ's being at once God and man do not concern Justin. For him the Incarnation is simply a fact; the Word became man. (123)

118. (contd.) Justin the interpretation of *οἰκονομία* as the plan of God unfolding gradually in history.

119. Dial. 100 (327C).

120. I Ap. 63 (96A); Dial. 126 (355B, C).

121. II Ap. 8 (46C, D).

122. I Ap. 32 (74B).

123. The paradox appears clearly in what was later to be called the communicatio idiomatum. On this Feder comments: 'Sie sind mehr die natürliche Folge der Überzeugung Justins von der Vereinigung der göttlichen und menschlichen Natur in der einen Person Christi, als der

At the same time, Justin also insists on the reality of Christ's manhood. Apart from asserting that the Word became man, which Justin frequently does without further comment,⁽¹²⁴⁾ Justin on occasion elaborates on the reality of the humanity of Christ. He sees this demonstrated principally in the sufferings of Christ.⁽¹²⁵⁾ As man, Christ is as totally dependent on the will of the Father as he is as the Word of God. Christ does not boast of accomplishing anything by his own will or might. It is even said that 'he shall be saved through the same God'.⁽¹²⁶⁾ This somewhat startling statement must be understood in its context, which is the exegesis of Psalm 22. There, with reference to the fact that Christ knew he was to suffer, it is said that ignorance is not on Christ's side, but on the side of those who thought that they would put him to death and 'that He,

123. (contd.) Ausfluss der bewussten Anwendung einer Methode, welche vielleicht selbst dem Begriffe nach ihm völlig unbekannt war' (op. cit., p. 174). Barnard (op. cit., pp. 118f.), Goodenough (op. cit., pp. 240f.), Little (op. cit., pp. 156f.) and Kelly (op. cit., pp. 146f.) all emphasise that Justin nowhere explains how Christ is both God and man. Even the statement that 'the whole Reason became the Christ who appeared for our sakes, body, reason and soul (τὸ λογικὸν τὸ ὅλον τὸν φανέντα δι' ἡμᾶς Χριστὸν γεγυέναι, καὶ σῶμα καὶ λόγον καὶ ψυχὴν)' (II Ap. 10 (48C) has nothing to do with Apollinarianism (pace Otto), for the final phrase is simply one of Justin's expressions for the whole man. The passage says simply this: 'He was man entirely inasmuch as He was a being made up of body, soul, and spirit, but He was the Logos entirely inasmuch as this body, soul, and spirit was what the Logos Himself in His entirety had become' (Goodenough, op. cit., p. 241)

like some common mortal, would remain in Hades.' (127) Not at all, says Justin, for the Psalm, having referred to the fact that he is not ignorant, goes on to refer to the resurrection 'and this he has obtained from the Father.' (128) That Christ will be saved by God refers then to his resurrection and his complete dependence on the will of the Father and not to his need of redemption.

Thus the pre-existent Word of God 'submitted to be born a man of like passions with us, having a body according to the Father's will'. (129) But in the context of this passage a qualification is introduced. Christ is truly man, he is man among men ($\alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma \ \epsilon\nu \ \alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\iota\varsigma$) (130) but not man of men ($\alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma \ \epsilon\kappa \ \alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omega\nu$). (131) His is a unique manhood. So far as Justin is concerned, to admit that Christ was born as man of men is virtually to admit that 'he has become Christ by election ($\epsilon\kappa\lambda\omicron\gamma\eta \ \gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma \ \epsilon\iota\varsigma \ \tau\omicron \ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\nu \ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$)', (132) or, at the very least, to leave open the possibility of that interpretation. By holding to the uniqueness of Christ's manhood Justin denies any possibility of adoptionism, while at the same time continuing to affirm the true humanity. The same thing applies

124. I Ap. 23 (68C), 46 (83D,E), etc.

125. I Ap. 63 (96A); II Ap. 13 (51D); Dial. 34 (251D), 99 (326A - C), 100 (326D), 103 (331D).

126. Dial. 101 (328A); cf. Dial. 102 (329D, 330A).

127. Dial. 99 (326C). 128. Dial. 100 (326C).

129. Dial. 48 (267C). 130. I Ap. 23 (68C).

131. Dial. 76 (301B); cf. all of ch. 76, also Dial. 48 (267D), 54 (273D, 274A), 63 (286C,D).

132. Dial. 48 (267D); cf. Dial. 49 (268A) - κατ' ἐκλογήν.

to the birth of Christ. It is a real birth, but a unique one, in that it is a virgin-birth. The prophecy of Isaiah is fulfilled only by Christ; of the descendents of Abraham according to the flesh Christ alone has been born of a virgin;⁽¹³³⁾ Christ alone had despoiled Damascus and Samaria (in the coming of the magi) before he could call father or mother;⁽¹³⁴⁾ there was no point in prefixing to the prophecy 'Behold a virgin shall conceive' the words 'The Lord himself shall give you a sign' if normal sexual conception were envisaged. The sign is given so that the event should be known to have occurred by 'the operation of the power and will of the Maker of all things'.⁽¹³⁵⁾

In spite of the uniqueness of Christ's humanity, Justin also asserts his solidarity with the human race. Through his birth of the virgin Mary Christ is the son of the patriarchs, for Mary is the descendant of the patriarchs and of David.⁽¹³⁶⁾ Likewise Christ is called Son of man 'either because of his birth by the virgin, who was of the family of David, and Jacob, and Isaac, and Abraham; or because Adam was the father both of him (Christ) and of those who have been first enumerated from whom Mary derives her descent'.⁽¹³⁷⁾

133. Dial. 43 (262C).

134. Dial. 77f. (302C - 305B).

135. Dial. 84 (310A,B).

136. Dial. 45 (264A), 100 (326D), 101 (327D, 328A).

137. Dial. 100 (327A). The text reads: *διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν τὸν Ἀβραὰμ πατέρα*. The text has been variously emended and the form translated here (*αὐτοῦ τὸν Ἀδὰμ πατέρα*) has been adopted on the grounds that it alone offers an alternative explanation of the origin of the term, 'Son of man'.

This does not coincide well with the uniqueness of Christ's manhood, but Justin seems unaware of any contradiction. Nor does he develop this historical connection between Christ and the patriarchs into a point of theological importance for his doctrine of the Incarnation and the association in salvation history between Adam and Christ, as is done, for example, by Irenaeus.⁽¹³⁸⁾ The unique manhood of Christ in Justin's theology would make any such association in salvation history extremely difficult.

Justin discusses the baptism of Jesus in some detail. He points out, with regard to the baptism itself, that Jesus did not need baptism, but was baptised for the sake of identifying him to men as the Christ. The baptism, and especially the lighting of the dove on Christ's head and the declaration of the voice from heaven do not empower Jesus to be the Christ, they prove him to be so.⁽¹³⁹⁾

There is no room for adoptionism. Likewise the Spirit lighting on him in the form of a dove is not an indication that Christ lacked anything. On the contrary, as we have seen, Christ is the whole Logos; 'these enumerated powers of the Spirit (i.e. the seven spirits mentioned by Isaiah) have come on him, not because he stood in need of them, but because they would rest on him ($\epsilon\pi' \epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu\omicron\nu \acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\pi\alpha\nu\sigma\iota\nu \mu\upsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\upsilon\sigma\omega\nu \pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$), i.e. would find their accomplishment ($\pi\epsilon\rho\alpha\varsigma$) in him.'⁽¹⁴⁰⁾ As Justin explains, the prophets of old each had one or two of the powers, but they

138. See below, pp. 642ff. 139. Dial. 88 (316A - D).

140. Dial. 87 (314C).

were all present in Christ. Therefore prophecy ceased from the Jews, and it was necessary that these gifts should cease from the Jews, and having found their rest (*ἀναπαύσις*) in him, 'should again . . . become gifts which, from the grace of his Spirit's power, he imparts to those who believe in him, according as he deems each man worthy thereof.'⁽¹⁴¹⁾

The gifts of the Spirit now belong to the Church through Christ. By this interpretation Justin avoids any suggestion that Christ needed the Spirit for the effective working of his divine power. The theme of the cessation of the powers of the Spirit found previously in the prophets and then resting on Jesus and subsequently outpoured on the Church is clearly linked with the first section we considered: the transfer of the promises from Israel to the Church. While this can be viewed historically, i.e. as a chronological sequence passing through the Incarnate Word, some hesitation is required before this is regarded as salvation history in the fullest sense of the term that includes the working out of God's plan in history. It is a question of whether the historical progression inherent in the shift from the old Israel to the new is merely an accident of that shift or is an important theological principle in its own right. In the present section it is clearly incidental to Justin's thought.

Justin sees many typological references to the cross of Christ, some of them in unexpected places.⁽¹⁴²⁾ Among

141. Dial. 87 (315A).

142. Justin sees examples of the shape of the cross in ships' yard-arms, ploughs, spades, man's extended

other references is the serpent erected on the staff by Moses. (143) Justin maintains that Plato misinterpreted this figure when he referred to the Logos' being placed cross-wise in the universe. Justin rejects this notion, seeing in the figure a type of the cross. It does not occur to Justin to use the reference in Plato in conjunction with the figure of the serpent on the staff to indicate the cosmic role of the Logos in the universe. (144) With his doctrine of the *λόγος σπερματικός* Justin would in any case find such an argument unnecessary.

What is the relationship between the Incarnation and salvation history in the theology of Justin? We have seen that Justin sees the history of Israel as salvation history, regardless of the Jews' rejection of the activity of God on their behalf. Part of the significance of the prophecy of the person and work of Christ lies in the fact that it is given beforehand. The Incarnation takes place according to the will of God, though it is the fact of the Incarnation rather than the event as an event in history that Justin refers to. Furthermore, Justin insists on the historicity of the Incarnation, and even details the time in history in which it took place ('under Pontius Pilate . . . in the

142. (contd.) arms, the nose on the face, the vexilla (I Ap. 55 (90C - E)), the crossed spits for the wholly roasted lamb (Dial. 40 (259B,C)), Moses with his arms outstretched to defeat Amalek (Dial. 90 (317D, 318A)), etc.

143. I Ap. 60 (92E - 93B); cf. Dial. 91 (319A,B).

144. Cf. Irenaeus, Dem. 34.

times of Tiberius Caesar').⁽¹⁴⁵⁾ Does all this add up to a scheme of salvation history in which history itself is progressing towards a goal, with the Incarnation as the major turning-point en route? C. Andresen, drawing on the study of B. Seeberg, would argue that it does.⁽¹⁴⁶⁾ He discusses the fact that it is the same Logos of the Father who becomes incarnate, and the prophecy of virgin-birth, and on the historical fact of the Incarnation refers to the careful dating. The clearest evidence however is to be found in those passages where the Incarnation is linked with the theophanies of the Old Testament.⁽¹⁴⁷⁾ He comments: 'The Incarnation of the Logos is seen as the last link in a chain of events, in which the Logos already appeared earlier on earth under other conditions and revealed the will of God the Father.'⁽¹⁴⁸⁾ The Incarnation certainly supercedes the theophanies, but the historical chain of events is of so little importance to Justin that he does not bother to place the theophanies in historical order.⁽¹⁴⁹⁾ It is the same Logos in Old Testament and in the Incarnation but it is doubtful whether Justin's interest goes beyond that.

145. I Ap. 13 (60D,E).

146. Andresen, op. cit., pp. 316 - 23; Seeberg, art. cit.

147. He refers to I Ap. 63 (96D).

148. Andresen, op. cit., p. 322; cf. Seeberg art. cit., p. 40, where he maintains that the work of the Logos in prophecy and fulfilment is viewed from the point of view of the *οἰκονομία*, by which he means an historical plan of God (cf. above, note 118).

149. Cf. Dial 126 (355B - 356D) where the theophanies to

Nevertheless, the Incarnation does form part of a pattern in Justin, but the pattern moves between the two points of the first and second comings of Christ. The pattern is one of contrast between the lowly first coming and the glorious second coming.⁽¹⁵⁰⁾ It is not simply a contrast between the two, for Justin sees events moving towards the consummation. Christ is 'first made subject to suffering, then returning to heaven, and again coming with glory.'⁽¹⁵¹⁾ 'Jesus, whom we also know to have been Christ the Son of God, was crucified, and rose again, and ascended to heaven, and will come again to judge all men, even up to Adam himself.'⁽¹⁵²⁾ Justin is aware of living between the two advents. The first advent is past, 'when he came as a dishonoured and suffering man'.⁽¹⁵³⁾ The lowliness and suffering are the distinguishing characteristics of the first coming. To such an extent is this true, in fact, that at the ascension Christ is not recognized. The rulers of heaven under God's appointment are commanded to open the gates of heaven, but 'when the rulers of heaven saw him of uncomely and dishonoured appearance, and inglorious, not recognising him, they inquired, "Who is this King of glory?" And the Holy Spirit, either from

149. contd.) Moses and Abraham are considered in that order, and the list of revelations is to Ezekiel, Daniel, Isaiah, David, Solomon, Moses, Zechariah, Isaiah, in that order (ibid.).

150. I Ap. 52 (87A,B); Dial. 14 (232D), 32 - 34 (249C - 253A), 49 (268B), 52 (271C), 110 (336D), 121 (350A, B), etc.

151. Dial. 34 (251D).

152. Dial. 132 (362A).

153. I Ap. 52 (87B).

the person of his Father, or from his own person, answers them, "The Lord of hosts, he is this King of glory." (154) After the ascension, the Father sets Christ at his own right hand until He makes his enemies his footstool. This suppression of his enemies takes place, says Justin, 'from the time that our Lord Jesus Christ ascended to heaven, after he rose again from the dead, the times now running on to their consummation (τῶν χρόνων συμπληρουμένων)' (155) Indeed, according to another passage, the consummation has been delayed. Christ is to be kept in heaven 'until he has subdued his enemies the devils, and until the number of those who are foreknown by him as good and virtuous is complete, on whose account he has still delayed the consummation (δι' οὗς καὶ μηδέπω τὴν ἐπικύρωσιν πεποιήται)' (156) A different interpretation of the delay is given in a further passage: 'Wherefore God delays causing the confusion and destruction of the whole world, . . . because of the seed of the christians, who know that they are the cause of preservation in nature (διὰ τὸ σπέρμα τῶν Χριστιανῶν, ὃ γινώσκει ἐν τῇ φύσει ὅτι αἴτιόν ἐστιν)' (157) Whatever

154. Dial. 36 (255B,C) = Ps. 24. Cf. Acta Pil. 21.

155. Dial. 32 (249E, 250A). 156. I Ap. 45 (82D).

157. II Ap. 7 (45B). Behind this perplexing passage there is one clear idea: the delaying of destruction on account of a righteous remnant (Cf. Gen. 18.16 - 33). Scholars are agreed that there is an oblique reference here to the idea of the λόγος σπερματικός, but the precise connection is difficult to determine. Goodenough (op. cit., pp. 163, 282f.), who interprets the λόγος σπερματικός in its impersonal sense finds a clear connection between the idea of the seed and the

the final phrase means it is clear that the delay of the end is on account of the Christians. Nevertheless it is impending. And already, in the Christians there are signs of the partial fulfilment of the prophecies of the end.⁽¹⁵⁸⁾

Eventually Christ will come the second time, this time in glory. In order to give, by implication, some idea of the glory and effect of the second coming Justin points to the effects of 'the dispensation (*οἰκονομία*) of his suffering'.⁽¹⁵⁹⁾ If Christ's name is known everywhere and the demons are subject to him as a result of his first coming, what will his second, glorious coming achieve?⁽¹⁶⁰⁾ Christ will come with his hosts of angels,⁽¹⁶¹⁾ and then will take place either the bodily resurrection of all,⁽¹⁶²⁾ the judgement by Christ, the renewal of heaven and earth through Christ and the establishing of the eternal Jerusalem,⁽¹⁶³⁾ or, according to another account, the resurrection of the faithful, the millenium in the earthly Jerusalem,

157. (contd.) preservation of nature, but admits that the association of this with the idea of a righteous remnant is hard to see. Andresen (art. cit., followed by Barnard, op. cit., pp. 161f.) interprets *λόγος σπερματικός* in an ethical sense and links it with the idea of 'seed forces' in Middle Platonism, but this leaves the physical preservation of nature unexplained.

158. Dial. 110 (336C - 337C).

159. Dial. 31 (247D). Cf. n. 118 above.

160. Dial. 30 (247C); cf. Dial. 121 (350 A,B).

161. I Ap. 52 (87B). 162. I Ap. 19 (65C - 66B).

163. Dial. 113 (340C), 139 (369A,B).

the general resurrection and the judgement.⁽¹⁶⁴⁾ Christ will judge all according to their deeds and the evil men and angels will suffer eternal punishment. Christ's enemies will be finally destroyed,⁽¹⁶⁵⁾ and he will reign for ever as king and priest.⁽¹⁶⁶⁾

The tension between the first coming of Christ in humiliation and his second coming in glory includes the idea of movement towards the second coming. Things are moving towards their goal, and Christ plays the decisive role both at the beginning and end of this movement. However, although it is possible for this movement to be interpreted as salvation history,⁽¹⁶⁷⁾ Justin's real

164. Dial. 80f. (306C - 308B). According to another passage again (II Ap. 7 (45C,D) there will be a final conflagration. This does not precisely coincide with either of the above schemes. Goodenough suggests that there has been a confusion of traditions (op. cit., pp. 288f.). Barnard, observing that the conflagration is mentioned only in the Apologies, suggests that Justin's views vary according to the circumstances in which he is writing (op. cit., p. 167).

165. I Ap. 28 (71B), 52 (87B); Dial. 120 (349B); cf. I Ap. 12 (59A,B), 17 (64D,E), where each man is said to be punished according as he deserves.

166. Dial. 36 (254C).

167. As does Andresen (op. cit., p. 323). His strongest evidence is the following passage: 'For I have proved that it was Jesus who appeared to and conversed with Moses, and Abraham, and all the other patriarchs without exception, ministering to the will of the Father, who also, I say, came to be born man by the Virgin Mary, and lives for ever. For the latter is he after whom and by whom the Father will renew both the heaven and the earth; this is he who shall shine

interest does not lie in the movement of history as such, but in the contrast between the two comings of Christ and the longing for the second coming which will put an end to the dominion of Christ's enemies, the demons.

The major themes by which Justin understands Christ's work of redemption have little direct association with salvation history. Christ's work of redemption is seen above all as the defeat of the demons who hold man in thrall. (168) Justin does not visualise the defeat of the powers of evil as a military campaign in which the progress of events can be seen and the extent of the territory held can be measured; his conviction is simply that with the coming of Christ the defeat of the demons is assured. Christ became incarnate for the express purpose of destroying the demons, (169) which is partially accomplished in Christ's first coming (170) and is completed while Christ sits enthroned at his Father's right hand. (171)

It is principally through his teaching that the victory of Christ is won. Although all men had a share of the *λόγος σπερματικός*, this was not sufficient to ensure their salvation. Moreover, the demons had perverted man's

167. (contd.) an eternal light in Jerusalem . . . etc.'

(Dial. 113 (340D)). Again, Justin has not put events in sequence; his interest lies rather in the fact that all these are activities of the one Christ.

168. I Ap. 14 (61A,B), 23 (68C,D), 54 (89A - 90B). II Ap. 5 (44 B,C); 9 (48A,B).

169. II Ap. 6 (45A).

170. Dial. 49 (269C), 78 (304D, 305A), 125 (354D, 355A).

171. I Ap. 45 (82D).

judgement by promulgating their own laws, 'in which the men who are like them delight; and the right Reason ($\rho\theta\omicron\varsigma$, $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$), when he came, proved that not all opinions nor all doctrines are good, but that some are evil, while others are good.' (172) In other words, the whole Logos restores man's soundness of judgement in the right use of his freewill. (173) Christ as Saviour is above all a teacher, (174) and he 'has come according to the power given him from the almighty Father ($\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}$ τὴν τοῦ παντοκράτορος πατρὸς δύναμιν δοθεῖσαν αὐτῷ), and summoning men to friendship ($\phi\iota\lambda\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$), and blessing ($\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$), and repentance ($\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\iota\alpha\nu$), and dwelling together ($\sigma\upsilon\nu\omicron\iota\kappa\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$), has promised', (175)

In this redemption from the power of the demons the cross appears to have a very minor place. Nevertheless Justin places great emphasis on the death of Christ on the cross. In his exegesis of the Old Testament Justin sees the type of the cross in many places. (176) In the cross is the only hope of man's salvation. (177) Christ's death was a

172. II Ap. 9 (48B).

173. Man had been endowed with free-will, was therefore without excuse before God and would justly suffer for his sins. Moreover man had been given time to exercise his free-will with a view to repentance, but, being held in thrall by the demons man had been incapable of exercising his free-will properly (I Ap. 28 (71 B,C), 43 (80D - 81B); II Ap. 7 (45D - 46B); Dial. 102 (329A), 141 (370 B,C).

174. I Ap. 4 (55B), 13 (60D), 23 (68B); II Ap. 6 (45A,B); Dial. 85 (311B), 102 (328D, 329C), 121 (350A).

175. Dial. 139 (369A). 176. See above, note 142.

177. II Ap. 13 (51D); Dial. 13 (229D), 17 (234D,E), 41

sacrifice for sin and his blood cleanses from sin.⁽¹⁷⁸⁾
 It is the symbol of Christ's might and power.⁽¹⁷⁹⁾ By means
 of the cross Christ gathers mankind.⁽¹⁸⁰⁾ In spite of this,
 the cross plays a negligible part in the defeat of the
 demons,⁽¹⁸¹⁾ and Justin never explains how the death of
 Christ on the cross brings victory over the evil powers. In
 fact, only once does Justin attempt to make clear the
 significance of the cross, and he does so not in connection
 with the demons but in connection with the curse that Jesus
 took upon himself for the sake of man.⁽¹⁸²⁾

It is to be noted in all this that redemption for Justin
 has little or nothing to do with history. By that is not
 meant that Justin does not accept the historicity of the
 events of redemption. The events of Christ's suffering and
 death are for him real events, but his interest in them does
 not include an appreciation of them as the decisive turning-
 point in the historical process; they are not seen as the
 definitive act of God in salvation history. Furthermore,
 the defeat of the demonic powers has only the most tenuous
 connection with history; it is associated with both the
 Incarnation and the crucifixion, but history is not important
 here, for what matters is that Christ brings the truth.

177. (contd.)(260A), 43 (261D), 89 (317B), 94 (322A), 137
 (366D).

178. I Ap. 32 (74A); Dial. 13 (299D); 24 (241D), 40 (259A -
 D), 44 (263C), 54 (273D), 89 (317B), 111 (338C).

179. I Ap. 55 (90B). 180. Dial. 134 (364C).

181. Dial. 30 (247D), 94 (322A).

182. Dial. 94f. (321D - 323B); cf. Dial. 86 (314A).

On the other hand, Justin sometimes makes a connection between redemption and the past history of man. Justin compares Mary with Eve. Christ the Son of God 'became man by the virgin, in order that the disobedience which proceeded from the serpent might receive its destruction in the same manner in which it derived its origin. For Eve, who was a virgin and undefiled, having conceived the word of the serpent (τὸν λόγον τὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄφως συλλαβοῦσα), brought forth disobedience and death (παρακοὴν καὶ θάνατον ἔτεκε). But Mary the virgin received faith and joy (πίστιν δὲ καὶ χαρὰν λαβοῦσα Μαρία ἡ παρθένος), when the angel Gabriel announced the good tidings to her And by her has he been born (καὶ διὰ ταύτης γεγέννηται οὗτος), to whom we have proved so many scriptures refer'.⁽¹⁸³⁾

If we compare this with the concept of recapitulation in Irenaeus, we miss here completely the necessary connection that Irenaeus sees between the man of the first creation and Christ in the Incarnation.⁽¹⁸⁴⁾ Justin's interest here is solely in the contrast between the two women and the conditions that resulted from the action of each.⁽¹⁸⁵⁾ The historical possibilities of the comparison are not explored.

There is, however, a reference to recapitulation in Justin, in the fragment of his work against Marcion preserved by Irenaeus.⁽¹⁸⁶⁾ There it is said that 'from

183. Dial. 100 (327C,D). 184. See below, pp. 679ff.

185. The expression used by Irenaeus, 'recircumlatio' (adv. haer. III xxii 4; H. ii 123f.) is not found in Justin.

186. Irenaeus, adv. haer. IV vi 2; H. ii 158f.

the one God, who made this world, and fashioned us and both contains and administers everything, the only-begotten Son (unigenitus Filius) came to us, recapitulating his creation in himself (suum plasma in semetipsum recapitulans)'. The significance of this passage in a work against Marcion is clear; Justin wishes to emphasise the fact that Christ, the Word of God, comes to God's own work and not to the work of some other god or demiurge. We know what Irenaeus did with the theme of recapitulation, but its significance for Justin is difficult to determine. That it does not lie at the heart of Justin's theology as it does of Irenaeus's is clear from the fact that, with one exception, no hint of it is found elsewhere in Justin's extant works. Nevertheless, it is possible that on the periphery of Justin's theology lay the idea of Christ as the new Adam, the one who in his incarnation takes up again the man fallen into sin.⁽¹⁸⁷⁾ The exception is the statement that 'Christ, being the first-born of all creation (πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως ὧν), became again the beginning of another race (καὶ ἀρχὴ πάλιν ἄλλου γένους γέγονεν), regenerated by himself through water and faith and wood, which holds the mystery of the cross.'⁽¹⁸⁸⁾ Of

187. Cf. 'One thing, however, Justin in all probability did not formulate with precision, viz., the proposition that the special result of salvation, i.e., immortality, was involved in the incarnation of the Logos, in so far as that act brought about a real secret transformation of the whole mortal nature of man' (Harnack, History of Dogma, II, p. 223).

188. Dial. 138 (367D).

this regeneration Noah was the type. Once again the material is present for the construction of a theological system in which the Incarnation is the centre point of transition between the old humanity and the new, or of the development of man from childhood to maturity in Christ.⁽¹⁸⁹⁾ The only interest Justin displays, however, is in the typological parallels between Noah's escape from the flood by water, faith and wood, and Christ's redemption made accessible through baptism (water), faith and cross (wood).⁽¹⁹⁰⁾

There is one other case in which Justin, had he wished, could have linked redemption with the past history of man. He complains to Trypho that the Jews have excised from the scriptures certain passages, one of which is the following: 'The Lord God remembered his dead people of Israel who lay in the graves; and he descended to preach to them his own salvation.'⁽¹⁹¹⁾ Justin attributes this saying of unknown origin to Jeremiah. Where Irenaeus sees in this passage evidence of the totality of Christ's redemption right back to the first man Adam, Justin cites the passage for no other reason than that the Jews had removed it from the Old Testament. The use that Irenaeus makes of it within the

189. Cf. Kelly's reference (Early Christian Doctrines, 4th ed., London, 1968, p. 170) to the passage as 'an anticipation of the idea of recapitulation'.

190. Dial. 138 (367C - 368A).

191. Dial. 72 (298B). Cf. ch. 3 notes 63 and 116 and ch.4 note 140.

framework of salvation history does not occur to Justin.

There can be no doubt about the Christocentricity of Justin's thinking. Christ plays the decisive part in nearly every feature of his theology. Christ is the agent of creation. The theophanies of the Old Testament are manifestations of the Word of God who is Christ. The inspiration of the prophets is the work of the same Word of God. It is Christ who carries out the Father's will to redeem man. At the consummation it is Christ who will return in glory with his hosts of angels. In addition, as the Logos, Christ has a cosmic role, both as the logos in which every man shares and as the whole Logos who becomes incarnate to teach men the truth. Justin is also aware of the activity of God in history and of the movement of time towards its end. The history of the people of Israel is seen by Justin as the history of God's dealings with Israel; it is salvation history in spite of Israel's rebelliousness. Justin is aware of the movement from the Jewish nation through Christ to the new people of God, the Church. The Incarnation takes place in fulfilment of the purposes of God. Part of the significance of prophecy lies in the fact that it is delivered before the event signified takes place, so that belief in the event when it happens may be aroused. The Incarnation and the redemption through the cross take place strictly on the plane of history. Justin is also conscious of living in the period of the tension between the already of the lowly first coming of Christ and the not yet of his glorious coming towards which

events are moving. All these features are capable of being welded together into a total plan of the divine purposes worked out in history through Christ.

Has Justin made the final step of creating that synthesis? Some scholars would say so.⁽¹⁹²⁾ One or two factors, however, point in the other direction. In spite of the fact that nearly all the elements listed above can be united into a coherent whole, they never appear as a whole anywhere in Justin's work; they always remain, in general, in isolated fragments. Some associations are indeed made: the prophecies of the Incarnation and the Incarnation itself; the two advents of Christ; the Spermatic Logos and the whole Logos, Christ. Yet nowhere is a total scheme set out in which all the disparate elements are located. It seems wiser, therefore, to resist the temptation of giving to Justin's notoriously unsystematic theology this particular unity that it could have had. In addition, there are a number of features of his theology that have little or no direct connection with history in the sense of movement and progress towards a goal. This applies especially to his doctrine of redemption, in spite of his emphasis on the fact of the cross. Justin's doctrine of man shows hints of the idea of the connection

192. So, e.g., Feder (op. cit., pp. 221f.), B. Seeberg (art. cit.), Grillmeier (op. cit., p. 107) and Andresen (op. cit., p. 323). In the cases of Feder, Seeberg and Andresen the arguments are cumulative, but the accumulation is not to be found in Justin himself.

between creation and the Incarnation, but Justin does not develop them. It is to Irenaeus that we must turn for that development and for the unification of these and other themes into a coherent pattern of Christocentric salvation history.

IV THEOPHILUS OF ANTIOCH

Of all the works that Theophilus wrote, only the three books he wrote in defence of the Christian faith to his friend Autolytus are now extant.⁽¹⁹³⁾ The fact that Theophilus ends his chronology of world history with the death of Marcus Aurelius indicates that Book III was presumably written in 180 AD or shortly after. The arrangement of the material in ad Autolytum by no means follows a clearly defined structure, and it is possible that Theophilus made use of catachetical material at his disposal.⁽¹⁹⁴⁾ There are also certain indications that

193. The editions used are those by Bardy, Théophile d'Antioche Trois Livres à Autolytus, edited by G. Bardy, with translation by J. Sender (Paris, 1948; = Sources chrétiennes 20) and R.M. Grant, Theophilus of Antioch ad Autolytum (Oxford, 1970; = Oxford early Christian Texts). On matters of general introduction the edition of Bardy (pp. 7 - 19) should be consulted. See also Grant, 'The Problem of Theophilus', in HThR 43 (1950), pp. 179 - 96, on the background of Theophilus. The translation used is that by Grant.
194. See Grant, Theophilus, pp. xf.

the three books were to some extent independent, though in the work as a whole some subjects recur. (195)

It is in connection with the doctrine of man that Theophilus's theology attests an interest in the ideas of growth and development, that is, of a movement towards a goal. It remains to be seen in what sense this is associated with history, and above all salvation history, and also what is the role of Christ in that development. In Book II of ad Autolycum, Theophilus devotes a long section to the exegesis of the early chapters of Genesis. (196) In this section he considers the creation of man. To the act of creation itself we shall shortly return. Man himself was created by God and set in paradise. God placed man there, 'giving him an opportunity for progress (ἀφορμὴν προκοπῆς) so that by growing and becoming mature (αὐξανὼν καὶ τέλειος γινόμενος), and furthermore having been declared a god (καὶ θεὸς ἀναδελχθεὶς), he might also ascend into heaven (for man was created in an intermediate state (μέσος γὰρ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐγεγόνει), neither entirely mortal nor entirely immortal, but capable of either state; . . .), possessing immortality' (II 24). Theophilus gives here

195. Grant emphasizes the independent nature of the three books ('Theophilus of Antioch to Autolycus', in HThR 40(1947), pp. 227 - 56). On the other hand, Bardy points out that the recurrence of some subjects gives to the work as a whole a kind of unity (Théophile, pp. 30ff.).

196. ad Autol. II 11 - 32. Grant shows clearly the Jewish or Jewish-Christian nature of the exegesis (HThR 40 (1947), pp. 234ff.).

clear expression to the idea that man should progress towards perfection. God created man with a view to his ultimate destiny, to be included in the divine level of existence.⁽¹⁹⁷⁾ In the hands of Irenaeus the theme of man's development is understood as an historical progress, in that God through his salvation history was preparing man for his final destiny. In this historical process the Incarnation plays a crucial role.⁽¹⁹⁸⁾ In Theophilus the development is not historical but individual. When he speaks of man's growth, he means not mankind in general, but each man in particular.⁽¹⁹⁹⁾ Man's growth is primarily

197. That is, man becomes immortal, for to the Apologists immortality presupposed divinity. Cf. Theophilus's statement: 'For if God had made him (man) immortal from the beginning, he would have made him God ($\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\nu \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\nu \pi\epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\eta\kappa\epsilon\iota$)' (II 27). This does not mean that man would have become part of the Trinity, so to speak, for the word $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ had a certain flexibility.

198. See below, pp. 634ff.

199. As will appear from the number of points at which, in discussing Theophilus, we have to refer to comparisons in Irenaeus, there is an undoubted relationship between Theophilus and Irenaeus. To accept the conclusions of Loofs (Theophilus von Antiochien, esp. pp. 44 - 80) that Irenaeus was slavishly dependent on Theophilus entails ignoring the unifying themes of Irenaeus's own theology. Under those conditions it is possible to find close parallels in thought between the two writers in certain sections of their writings, while failing to see the significant differences that must be taken into account especially when Irenaeus's theology is seen first in its unity. Bardy (Théophile, p. 283) provides a useful list of the closest parallels between Theophilus and Irenaeus, though Loofs finds a great many more.

related to his ethical perfection that comes from obedience to God. Theophilus discusses the question whether man was created mortal or immortal (II 27). Neither, he says, but capable of both. 'If he were to turn to the life of immortality by keeping the commandment of God, he would win immortality as a reward from him and would become a god; but if he turned to deeds of death, disobeying God, he would be responsible for his own death'. (II 27). The gaining of life or death is dependent on each man's conduct, and progress to eternal life is not linked to any idea of mankind's progress. 'For as by disobedience man gained death for himself, so by obedience to the will of God whoever will can obtain eternal life for himself (ὑπακούσας τῷ θελήματι τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ βουλούμενος δύναται περιποιήσασθαι ἑαυτῷ τὴν αἰώνιον ζωὴν). For God gave us a law and holy commandments; everyone who performs them can be saved (ὡς πᾶς ὁ ποιήσας δύναται σωθῆναι) and, attaining to the resurrection, can inherit imperishability' (II 27).

That the growth and progress is an individual matter can be seen again in the events associated with Adam's fall. Adam ate of the tree of knowledge and died; but, says Theophilus, the disastrous consequences of Adam's act stem not from the fact that the tree was evil in itself, but from the fact that, in eating from it, Adam disobeyed. 'In his actual age, Adam was as old as an infant; therefore he was not yet able to acquire knowledge properly Therefore God was not jealous, as some suppose, in ordering

him not to eat of knowledge' (II 25). The age of Adam has nothing to do with the idea found in Irenaeus that mankind was in a childlike state and therefore easily led astray by Satan; (200) here the age of Adam is no more than one of the explanations for God's prohibition of eating from the tree of knowledge. It was also a test of obedience (II 25), and God 'wanted the man to remain simple and sincere for a longer time, remaining in infancy' (II 25). Here again it is not mankind's infancy that is in Theophilus's mind. As the examples he quotes show, Theophilus believes that 'it is shameful for infant children to have thoughts beyond their years ' (II 25). (201)

As a result of his disobedience man is cast out of paradise, and 'acquired pain, suffering, and sorrow, and finally fell victim to death' (II 25). In all this, however, Theophilus sees signs of God's mercy. God 'did not let him (sc. man) remain for ever in a state of sin but, so to speak, with a kind of banishment he cast him out of paradise, so that through this punishment he might expiate his sin in a fixed period of time (τακτῶ χρόνῳ) and after chastisement might later (ἐξ ὁστέρου) be recalled' (II 26). This explains, says Theophilus, the double reference in Genesis to the placing of man in paradise (Gen. 2.8, 15). The

200. Again the significant thing is not Irenaeus's use of material also found in Theophilus but the different use to which he puts it. See below, pp. 629ff.

201. Kelly comments: 'Like Justin, therefore, both of them (sc. Tatian and Theophilus) seem to accept the Pauline

second reference is to be fulfilled after the resurrection and judgement (II 26). It is tempting to see in the reference to a fixed period of time a recognition of the period of human history from creation to the consummation. (202) This is not the case, however. The close link which Theophilus makes here and in what immediately follows between the casting out from paradise and man's death, and between the second entry to paradise and the resurrection, makes it clear that the fixed period of time refers to the duration of man's mortal life, in which man is chastised though later he may receive the reward of his obedience. So also the reference to the fact that the sin of man made some beasts wild, and that they will become tame when man returns to his natural state (II 17), encompasses a period of time, but there is no suggestion of development or growth towards the desired goal.

201.(contd.) teaching in so far as it links the entrance of sin and death into the world with Adam's act of disobedience; but neither of them, any more than Justin, sees that act as more than a type of the disobedience of the race, although its consequences persist in the subjection of Adam's descendants to labour, pain, death and, of course, the power of evil spirits' (Early Christian Doctrines, p. 168).

202.Cf. Irenaeus's statement that God hated the one who seduced man, but 'on him who had been seduced, he gradually and little by little had mercy (sensim paulatimque misertus est)' (adv.haer.III xxiii 5; H. ii 128). See below, pp. 631ff.

As a final indication that man's development is not viewed historically by Theophilus we may consider the role that revelation plays in this growth of man. 'The God and Father and Maker of the universe did not abandon mankind (τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα) but gave a law and sent holy prophets to proclaim and to teach the human race (τὸ γένος τῶν ἀνθρώπων) so that each one of us might become sober and recognise that God is one' (II 34). There is nothing here about teaching gradually or by stages and the content of the teaching is not the gradual unfolding of the divine purposes in history but the oneness of God and moral purity, as the conclusion of the section illustrates, and 'that thus a person who acts righteously (δικαιοπραγῶν) may escape the eternal punishments and be judged worthy of receiving eternal life from God' (II 34). Once again it is a question of individual effort not of corporate development.

Not only is the development of man not viewed historically, but when Theophilus considers history he does not see it as salvation history. The second half of Book III of ad Autolyicum (III 16 - 29) is devoted to a demonstration that Christian history is more accurate and more ancient than any other. To prove that it is more ancient Theophilus makes use of chronologies. (203) Christian history can be traced right back to the beginning

203. Bardy (Théophile, pp. 49ff.) and Grant (Theophilus, pp. xxiiiff.) both list Theophilus's chronology. Grant observes that the use of chronologies to prove antiquity (and therefore truth) was a common device of the period. See R.M. Grant, 'The Bible of Theophilus

of the world (III 16). No other history is as ancient. Theophilus draws his material from various sources. (204) What is significant here is that this is pure chronology. It is not the recital of the acts of God in history nor of the unfolding of the divine purposes. The Incarnation is not even mentioned. (205) Behind this there is a polemical intent that likewise has nothing to do with history: 'the Egyptian prophets and the Chaldaeans and the other writers should have made accurate declarations concerning the creation of the world and the making of man and the later events, if they really spoke by a divine and pure spirit and if the utterances made through them were true' (II 33). From this Theophilus can argue that Christians alone have the truth. (206) Here lies the point of the chronologies, not in their history, but in their value for proving the superiority of Christianity.

From this it is clear that there is no doctrine of

203. (contd.) of Antioch', in JBL 66 (1947), pp. 173 - 96, esp. pp. 189 - 95).

204. Theophilus mentions Berossus (ad Autol. III 29), Menander Ephesius (III 22f.), Manetho (III 20f.), Josephus (III 23), Chryseros Nomenclator (III 27) and Thallus (III 29). The first three were used by Josephus and it is presumably from him that Theophilus takes them. See Grant, 'The Bible of Theophilus.'

205. Bardy (Théophile, p. 53) observes that the force of the argument from antiquity would be lessened if Christ's birth were included. This is only partly true, for the importance of the Incarnation does not exclude the fact of revelation in the period of the Old Testament right back to creation itself.

206. ad Autol. II 33; cf. III 29.

Christocentric salvation history in Theophilus of Antioch. Nevertheless, before leaving him it is worth noting the activity of God in the affairs of men, and the role played by Christ. The formation of man is the climax of creation, and to man all other things in creation are subject (II 18). The dignity of man consists of the fact that 'after making everything else by a word (λόγῳ), God considered all this as incidental (παράρρητα); he regarded the making of man as the only work worthy of his own hands (μόνον ἰδίῳ ἔργον χειρῶν ἁγίων)' (II 18).⁽²⁰⁷⁾ The dignity of man does not consist in the fact that he is made in the image of God, but that he is made by God's own hands and not simply by God's word of command. Such is man's dignity that when God made the light and saw that it was good, he meant, says Theophilus, good for man (II 11). Also when, before the ages, God existed alone, 'he wished to make man so that he might be known by him; for him, then, he prepared the world' (II 10). The importance of man is further emphasised in that God requires assistance in the making of man: 'Furthermore, God is found saying 'Let us make man after the image and likeness' as if he needed assistance (ὡς βοηθείας χρήσων); but he said 'Let us make' to none other than his own Logos and his own Sophia (τῷ ἑαυτοῦ λόγῳ καὶ τῇ ἑαυτοῦ σοφίᾳ)' (II 18). It is through the Word of God and the Wisdom of God that creation takes place.⁽²⁰⁸⁾

What is the relationship of the Word and Wisdom to

207. The mss read ἁγίων, which Bardy retains. Grant follows Gesner in reading ἰδίῳ.

208. ad Autol. I 7; cf. II 10, 13.

each other, to God, to the Spirit and to the created world? The Logos-doctrine of Theophilus is relatively straightforward. As Theophilus states at some length (I 3 - 5), God is transcendent, ineffable and inexpressible, uncreated, immutable, immortal. Above all he is one, and therefore made all things out of nothing (II 10), this very thing demonstrating God's power (II 4, 13). At the same time, God's transcendence does not imply a lack of concern for the world and the affairs of men. The names that are given to God are all related by Theophilus to God's dealings with and for man (I 3). Theophilus considers the appearance of God to Adam in paradise (II 22). This was not the God and Father of the universe, 'for he is unconfined and is not present in a place'; it is 'his Logos, through whom he made all things, who is his Power and Wisdom (*δύναμις ὡν καὶ σοφία αὐτοῦ*), assuming the role of the Father and Lord of the universe (II 22). Likewise the voice that Adam hears is the Logos of God (II 22). This Logos, who is also God's Son, was begotten not by sexual union, 'but as the truth described the Logos, always innate in the heart of God (*ὡς ἀλήθεια διηγεῖται τὸν λόγον τὸν ὄντα διὰ παντὸς ἐνδιάθετον ἐν καρδίᾳ θεοῦ*). For before anything came into existence he had this as his Counsellor, his own Mind and Intelligence (*τοῦτον εἶχεν σύμβουλον, ἑαυτοῦ νοῦν καὶ φρόνησιν ὄντα*)' (II 22). Theophilus is here clearly thinking of the analogy of the way in which *λόγος* can mean both the rational faculty and the thought expressed. (209)

The Word of God is in the first instance God's Reason, God

'having his own Logos innate in his own bowels (τὸν ἑαυτοῦ λόγον ἐνδιάθετον ἐν τοῖς ἰδίῃς σπλάγχνοις)' (II 10).

From this it follows that 'before its generation or utterance by the Father the Logos was not a person distinct from him. It was essentially one of his attributes.' (210) Then, 'when God wished to make what he had planned to make, he generated this Logos, making him external, as the firstborn of all creation (τοῦτον τὸν λόγον ἐγέννησεν προφορικόν, πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως), He did not deprive himself of the Logos (οὐ κενώθεις αὐτὸς τοῦ λόγου), but generated the Logos and constantly conversed with his Logos (ἀλλὰ λόγον γεννήσας καὶ τῷ λόγῳ αὐτοῦ διὰ παντὸς ὁμιλῶν)' (II 22). There are certain similarities here

209. Grant (in HThR 40, pp. 245 - 49) discusses Theophilus's Logos-doctrine and gives a brief account of the Stoic use of the terms λόγος ἐνδιάθετος and λόγος προφορικός, from which Theophilus's use of the distinction ultimately derives. See also M. Spannert, *op. cit.*, pp. 310 - 16.

210. Grant, in HThR 40, p. 248. This judgement is perhaps a little severe; the Word is the Father's counsellor prior to creation when he was in God (II 22), even though this concession of personality is at once compromised by equating this counsellor with God's Mind and Intelligence. Little (*op. cit.*, pp. 199 - 201) maintains that the internal Logos is more than an attribute. Lebreton (*op. cit.*, pp. 510f.) acknowledges the confusion and considers that Theophilus has by no means escaped the dangers of the analogy.

between Theophilus and Justin Martyr,⁽²¹¹⁾ but Theophilus states openly what Justin seems to have avoided, that the Logos existed in two distinct stages, as God's reason, and then as God's expressed reason for the purpose of creation, but the movement suggested by this idea is not pursued into the idea of the Word's movement through history to the Incarnation. Theophilus's exegesis of Genesis 1.1 again illustrates the role played by the Word in creation. 'Εν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός means in fact διὰ τῆς ἀρχῆς (II 13), and 'the Beginning' is none other than the Logos by whom all things were made (II 10). The Word is begotten for the purpose of creation, which underlines the subordination of the Word inherent in Theophilus's theology.⁽²¹²⁾

211. Justin, however, does not pursue the analogy to its logical conclusion in the representation of the Logos as first an attribute in God and then a distinct personality. See above, p.225.

212. The theology of Theophilus is characterised by a strong monotheism, arising not only from a reaction against Marcionism and pagan polytheism, but also from Theophilus's proximity to Hellenistic Judaism 'with which most of his doctrine has close affinities' (Grant, Theophilus, p. xv). As a corollary of this monotheism, the Son has a subordinate role. In creation he is the servant of the Father (ἐπουργός) (II 10). As transcendent the Father cannot be manifested in any place, but the Word can be (II 22), and appears in the theophanies at the Father's bidding (ibid.). As Lebreton observed (op. cit., p. 512), there are 'dans sa théologie de la création et dans son exégèse des théophanies, certains traits subordinationnels que l'on peut malaisément effacer.'

Along with the Word, God generated his Wisdom (*σοφία*) (II 10). Theophilus does not define the precise relationship of the Wisdom of God to the Word of God⁽²¹³⁾. The prophets were not present at creation, and the reason that anything can be known about the creation at all is that 'the Sophia of God which is in him and his holy Logos who is always present with him' were there (II 10). At the same time, Moses as the instrument of the Logos spoke the opening words of Genesis, 'For the divine Sophia knew in advance that some persons were going to speak nonsense . . . ' (II 10). The Logos is God's 'power and wisdom' (II 22), and 'Spirit of God and Beginning, and Sophia and Power of the Most High', and as such he instructed the prophets about the creation (II 10). Up to this point the virtual identity of Logos and Sophia seems clear and one thinks of Christ as Logos and Christ as Wisdom in the New Testament⁽²¹⁴⁾ as the source of the confusion. But alongside all this we should also note that revelation to the prophets takes place through the Spirit of God (I 14), and the Holy Spirit spoke through Moses and the other prophets (II 30), and, moreover, men of God who were possessed of a holy Spirit were taught by God and became 'instruments of God and containing Wisdom from him. Through Wisdom they spoke about the creation of the world ' (II 9). Furthermore,

213. The relationships are more precisely defined by Irenaeus when he consistently identifies the Word and Wisdom as the Son and Spirit. See below, pp. 568ff.
214. Jn. 1.1; I Cor. 1.24, etc.

creation takes place through the Word and Wisdom, identified as the hands of God,⁽²¹⁵⁾ the Word and Spirit (I 7). God, his Logos and his Sophia form a triad.⁽²¹⁶⁾ From all this it is clear that Theophilus had devised no system in which each of the divine persons had a precise role.⁽²¹⁷⁾ The Logos and the Spirit both have to some extent defined roles, the one in the creation and the theophanies and the other in prophecy, but even here the roles are not entirely separate.⁽²¹⁸⁾ Sophia, however, is linked now with the Logos and now with the Spirit.⁽²¹⁹⁾

215. ad Autol. II 18. The strict monotheism that lies behind this conception of Theophilus can be seen in the emphasis that he places on the fact that God spoke to none other than his own Logos and his own Sophia (τῷ ἑαυτοῦ λόγῳ καὶ τῇ ἑαυτοῦ σοφίᾳ) (ibid.); they are not so much helpers as instruments, precisely in fact, God's hands. The expression loses some of its monotheistic rigour in Irenaeus since he gives to both Word and Spirit more distinct personalities. See below, pp. 579ff.

216. ad Autol. II 15. This is the first known use of a word of this sort to describe the Godhead in Christian literature. Theophilus does not discuss the term any further, and that it is not precisely the Trinity is indicated by the fact that man can be added to it to make a tetrad. See Grant, Theophilus, ad loc., p. 53. On the Trinity in Theophilus see further below, note 219.

217. It should be noted that the Spirit we have been discussing above, whose role is related to revelation, is to be distinguished from another meaning of spirit in Theophilus. The spirit is also the breath of God that sustains the physical universe (ad Autol. I 5, 7, 12; II 13).

218. The Logos, for example, has a role in revelation (II 10).

note

219. A brief word must be said about the background to this trinitarian conception in Theophilus. The figure of Wisdom is drawn ultimately from the Wisdom Literature of Hellenistic Judaism. In one line of tradition the figure of Wisdom is associated with Christ especially in his creative activity (cf. Col. 1.15 - 18); this is a parallel to the Logos-tradition of John 1.1 - 18. In this tradition Christ is both Word and Wisdom. G. Kretschmar argues (Studien zur frühchristlichen Trinitätstheologie, pp. 27 - 61) that behind Theophilus's trinitarian conceptions there is another Wisdom tradition also going back to Hellenistic Judaism. In this tradition there is the hiddenness of Wisdom (Ethiopic Enoch 42, 48, 49) who cannot dwell with men, but now dwells in the Church, and the associated idea of the pre-existence of the Church (cf. II Clem. 14.1). Thus there are two streams by which Jewish Wisdom traditions came into the Church, Wisdom being associated either with the Church or with Christ. In addition there is evidence of the identification of Wisdom with the Spirit at a relatively early stage (Gospel of the Hebrews and Epistula Apostolorum). Kretschmar's investigation of the background of Theophilus's trinitarian theology is undertaken to show the falsity of Loofs's conclusions about it (expressed mainly in his Paulus von Samosata but cf. his Theophilus von Antiochien, pp. 44 - 58). Loofs maintained that the monarchian trinitarianism represented by Theophilus was the primary form of trinitarian theology in the early Church. This, as Kretschmar has shown conclusively, is not the case. The tradition from which the monarchian form of trinitarianism was derived was not itself monarchian. The monarchian strain is the result of Theophilus himself. 'So ergibt sich die paradoxe Tatsache, dass der erste kirchliche Theologe, bei dem wir das Wort *τριάς* finden, es in einem Sinne gebraucht, der von der Trinitätslehre der Kirche letzten Endes recht weit entfernt ist.' (Kretschmar, op. cit., p. 61).

The work of the Word of God is by no means limited to creation. He has an important part to play in the giving of the teaching through the prophets so that man may make the right choice and live righteously. In the first place it is the Word who appears in the theophanies, as Theophilus explains in his exegesis of John 1.1 - 3. At first 'God was alone and the Logos was in him ($\mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma, \eta\acute{\nu} \delta' \theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\nu \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega} \delta' \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$). . . . Since the Logos is God and derived his nature from God ($\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma \omicron\upsilon\nu \omega\nu \delta' \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\kappa \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon \pi\epsilon\phi\upsilon\kappa\omega\varsigma$), whenever the Father of the universe wills to do so he sends him into some place where he is present and is heard and seen. He is sent by God and is present in a place' (II 22). So it is the Logos who appears to Adam (II 22). The Logos also 'came down into the prophets and spoke through them about the creation of the world and all the rest' (II 10). It is from the prophets that men are taught (II 34). Ultimately therefore, the teaching of men is by the Logos.

The Incarnation has no place in the theology of Theophilus as it is expressed in the three Books of his ad Autolycom. (220) It is very tempting to devise a theology for Theophilus that would include the Incarnation, and to trace some of the themes we have seen above to their conclusion in the work of Christ; to see, for example, in the teaching on man's growth a hint that Christ would have appeared as the perfect man; to see in the emphasis on

Adam's disobedience a suggestion that this would be balanced by a corresponding obedience in Christ; to see in the teaching role of the Word in the prophets a sketch of the work of Christ as principally a work of teaching.⁽²²¹⁾ The temptation must be firmly resisted. We do not know what significance the Incarnation had for Theophilus, and we are in grave danger of reading Theophilus's theology in the light of one who did draw these and other themes together; Irenaeus. There is, quite simply, no evidence of Christocentric salvation history in Theophilus, even though many of the themes found in Theophilus recur in Irenaeus in the setting of Christocentric salvation history.⁽²²²⁾

221. The above suggestions regarding Theophilus's understanding of the work of Christ are made by Grant (Theophilus, p. xvii). On the teaching work of Christ there is one hint that may well point in that direction. Theophilus says: 'The gospel voice (ὁ δὲ εὐαγγελῆλιος φωνή) provides a stricter teaching about purity', and he quotes the words of Jesus on adultery (Mt. 5.28, 32) (ad Autol. III 13). 'The gospel voice' appears to be a circumlocution to avoid the name of Jesus, and it may indicate that Theophilus regarded the Incarnation as another theophany of the Logos (See Grant, in HThR 40, p. 249).
222. Grant (in HThR 40, pp. 227 - 29) makes some pertinent comments about the relations and differences between Theophilus and Irenaeus.

V MELITO OF SARDIS

Although the one complete extant work of Melito is not an Apology, there is sufficient justification for discussing him under the general heading of the Apologists, both because he wrote an Apology, addressed to Marcus Aurelius, of which some fragments have been preserved, and because, from the point of view of chronology, he belongs to the general period of the Apologists.⁽²²³⁾ In form the Paschal Homily appears to be a Christian development and combination of the Jewish pre-Paschal homily and the

223. On matters of general introduction to Melito see the edition by Perler (Méliton de Sardes. Sur la Pâque et fragments, edited by O. Perler, Paris, 1966; = Sources chrétiennes 123) pp. 7 - 24. The authenticity of the work, contested by P. Nautin, is no longer disputed (See Perler, op. cit., pp. 16 - 23, F.L. Cross, The Early Christian Fathers, p. 104, J. Daniélou, 'Figure et événement chez Méliton de Sardes', in Neotestamentica et Patristica, Leiden, 1962 = Supplements to NT 6, pp. 282 - 92, p. 282). The edition used here is that by Perler, for both the Paschal Homily and the fragments. He reprints the fragments from the sources in which they were contained, without giving a new edition (Perler, op. cit., p. 215). The fragments are accepted as authentic, with the exception of No. XII. Perler suggests (op. cit., pp. 23f.) that the Paschal Homily was written 'entre 160 et 170 environ'. Since the edition by Perler in 1966 a Georgian version of chapters 1 - 45 has been found (J.N. Birdsall, 'Melito of Sardis $\Pi\epsilon\rho\iota\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \Pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\alpha$ in a Georgian version', in Le Muséon 80 (1967), pp. 120 - 38) and, even more recently, a Georgian version of chapters 46 - 105 has been discovered (referred to by

and the Paschal Haggadah. (224)

223. (contd.) S.G. Hall in his Article 'Melito in the Light of the Passover Haggadah' in JTS n.s. 22(1971), pp. 29 - 46, reference on p. 41).
224. When C. Bonner first edited the Paschal Homily of Melito he described it as 'what would today be called a Good Friday Sermon' (C. Bonner, The Homily on the Passion by Melito Bishop of Sardis with some Fragments of the Apocryphal Ezekiel, London, 1940; = Studies and Documents 12, p. 19). As F.L. Cross noted (Early Christian Fathers, pp. 104f.) the description is a little misleading, even as an analogy, for in the second century Good Friday and Easter Day were a single feast, and the work is not a sermon in the modern sense of that word. Cross considered that the work was a Christian counter-part of the Jewish Haggadah. In structure, however, there are some notable differences and S.G. Hall has shown (art. cit.) that only the second part of the Paschal Homily (Pasch.Hom. 46 - 105) shows close parallels to the Jewish Haggadah. The first part (Pasch.Hom. 1 - 45) more closely resembles a pre-Paschal homily. On the basis of the clear division in the Paschal Homily at chapter 46, the existence of the two parts separately in Georgian versions, and the reference in Eusebius (H.E. IV 26.2) to two works on the Easter Festival, Hall argues that the Paschal Homily as we now have it may be two different works. Whether independent or parts of a single work the two sections are undeniably by the same man and deal with closely allied themes. See also Perler, op. cit., pp. 131 - 33. In style the work shows many features characteristic of a praeconium (Perler, op. cit., pp. 24 - 29; cf. also A. Wifstrand, 'The Homily of Melito on the Passion', in VC 2(1948), pp. 201 - 23).

The figure of Christ dominates the work of Melito, not only in that the Paschal Homily concerns the central event of man's salvation through Christ, but also in that Melito's theology is essentially Christocentric. This will become increasingly apparent as we proceed. The framework within which Melito sees the person and work of Christ is salvation history. This appears with perfect clarity and simplicity in the closing lines of the Paschal Homily:

'This is he who made the heaven and the earth, and who formed man in the beginning, who was proclaimed by the Law and the prophets, who was incarnate (σάρκωθεῖς)⁽²²⁵⁾ in a virgin, who was suspended on a tree, who was buried in earth, who was raised from the dead, and who ascended to the heights of the heavens, who is seated on the right hand of the Father, who has power to judge and to save all, (this is he) through whom the Father did everything from the beginning and for ever (δι' οὗ ἐποίησεν ὁ πατήρ τὰ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς μέχρι αἰώνων). He is the alpha and the omega, he is beginning and end (ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος), - beginning inexplicable and end incomprehensible - he is the Christ. He is the King. He is Jesus, he the commander (στρατηγός), he the Lord, he the resurrection of the dead, he the one who is seated at the right hand of the Father. He bears the Father and is borne by the Father, to whom (be) the glory and the power for ever. Amen.⁽²²⁶⁾

225. This is the earliest known occurrence of this verb. See Perler, op. cit., pp.174f. Cf. Pasch. Hom. 70.

226. Pasch. Hom. 104f. Cf. Pasch. Hom. 47 - 72, also the partial lists Pasch. Hom. 82 - 86; 87 - 90, and the extremely detailed list in Melito Fr. XV.

Christ carries out the divine will from beginning to end, from creation to consummation. We shall take each of the stages of salvation history in turn, examine them in some detail and see the way in which the salvation history and the Christology are linked.

The primary interest of Melito is in the work of Christ, but he does give some indications of the way in which he thought of the one who carried out the divine purposes. Christ is the First-born of God (82), he is begotten before the morning star (82), he is the Word by whom all things were made (47), he is the alpha and omega (105), he is Word of God before the ages (Frag. II). On the evidence of a number of passages it has been suspected by some that Melito was a fore-runner of modalism. (227) Thus Melito states that Christ 'contains all (κεχώρηκεν τὰ πάντα)' (5), a strictly divine property; Christ is 'father in that he begets, Son in that he is begotten (καθ' ὃ γεννᾷ πατήρ, καθ' ὃ γεννᾶται υἱός)' (9); in the crucifixion of Christ 'God is murdered' (96); Christ 'bears the Father, and is borne by the Father (φορεῖ τὸν πατέρα καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς φορεῖται)' (105); Christ is 'true God from all eternity (θεὸς ἀληθὴς προκείμενος)' (Frag. VI). About statements of this sort several things must be said. In the first place, as we shall see in discussing the Incarnation, Melito lays great emphasis on the real divinity of Christ, and it is from this

227. E.g. by Bonner, op. cit., pp. 27f. and by Pollard, op. cit., p. 35.

emphasis that the statement about the murder of God stems. There is no doubt about the stress that Melito places on the divinity of Christ in that he accords him the divine function of containing all;⁽²²⁸⁾ he is God from all eternity. The really troublesome phrases, however, are those which speak of Christ's being Father in that he begets, and of his bearing the Father. In all probability, in the former case Christ is father in that he begets man in the spiritual life through baptism,⁽²²⁹⁾ and his being a Son because he is begotten may refer either to his begetting by the Father, or to his birth from Mary, but in either case the reference is to the Incarnation.⁽²³⁰⁾ In the second case it is not immediately apparent whether Melito is thinking of the relations between the Word and God, or of the relations

228. Perler (op. cit., p. 137) lists the relevant parallels to this idea of the immeasurability of Christ.

229. This has been convincingly demonstrated by G. Racle ('A propos du Christ-Père dans l'Homélie pascale de Méliton de Sardes', in RSR 50 (1962), pp. 400 - 08). Racle points out that the context of the present passage is concerned with who Christ is in his work of salvation for man. The passage as a whole from which the phrase under discussion comes can be divided into two groups of four titles. 'Les quatre premiers titres (Loi, Parole, Grâce, Père) caractériseraient le Christ par rapport aux effets de l'oeuvre de salut qu'il a accomplie, les quatre derniers (Fils, agneau, homme, Dieu) caractériseraient la réalisation de l'oeuvre de salut elle-même.' (art. cit., p. 407). Cf. Perler, op. cit., pp. 141f.

230. See Racle, art. cit., pp. 406f.

between the divine and the human in Christ. In systematic terms, should the passage be discussed under the Trinity or under Christology? That Christ is borne by the Father is a clear and precise trinitarian statement, but that Christ bears the Father is best understood as Christological, for in that sense there are obvious parallels in the Johannine literature and in the literature of the early Church.⁽²³¹⁾ Neither passage then, is strictly modalist. In addition to all this the strong statements of Melito on the divinity of Christ must be balanced by those statements in which there is a clear distinction made between the Father and the Son. God creates 'through the Word' (47; cf. 104). The Father sends the Son from heaven (Frag. XIII). Christ is the first-born of God (82). The Son is seated at the Father's right hand (104f). The Son will manifest the Father (103). The Jews are to pray to God that, if it is God's will that his Son should suffer, it should not be at the hands of Israel (76). If Melito is not always as precise in his use of language as would have been demanded in a later age, he is nevertheless not a modalist. Christ who carries out the divine intention in all respects is God, but is not confused with the Father.

Melito describes the creative work of the Word in

231. See Perler, *op. cit.*, pp. 211f., who gives the relevant New Testament and Patristic parallels to the idea of Christ bearing the Father.

some detail. We shall summarise the main points here.

'God in the beginning, having made the heaven and the earth and everything in them through the Word (διὰ τοῦ λόγου), fashioned man from the earth and to the form gave the breath of life (καὶ εἶδε, ἀναπνοὴν μετέδωκεν).⁽²³²⁾ God's direct involvement in the creation of man is stressed, and in another passage, in which the detail of the Word's creative activity is specified, it is expressly stated that Christ, the first-born of God is he 'who fashioned man for himself on earth (ὁ τὸν ἐπὶ γῆς ἀναπλασάμενος ἄνθρωπον)'.⁽²³³⁾ At the very beginning of creation Melito emphasises God's concern for man. Man was placed in paradise 'to live there happily (ἐκεῖ τρυφᾶν) (47), and was commanded not to eat from the tree of knowledge of good and evil. Man was capable of receiving both good and evil and received the evil counsellor and disobeyed God. 'He was therefore cast out into this world (εἰς τοῦτον τὸν κόσμον) as into a prison of condemned men' (48). In this it is to be noted that Melito locates Paradise out of this world and says nothing about man's being in a childlike state at his creation.⁽²³⁴⁾ From this it is apparent that

232. Pasch. Hom. 47. In particular, the use of the definite article makes the reference to the Logos a clear reminiscence of Jn.1.3. See Perler, op. cit., p. 161.

233. Pasch. Hom. 83; cf. 79, 'You even bound his fine hands (τὰς καλὰς αὐτοῦ χεῖρας), which fashioned you from the earth (αἶσε ἐπλασαν ἀπὸ γῆς).' The creative hands are Christ's hands. Cf. Theophilus of Antioch and Irenaeus who speak of the hands of God, the Word and Wisdom (Theophilus) or Son and Spirit (Irenaeus).

234. Cf. Theophilus (above pp.260f) and Irenaeus (below, pp.620ff.).

the idea of man's progress is not included in Melito's understanding of Christocentric salvation history. On his death, man left a legacy to his children, but it was a legacy of evil (49 - 53). The condition of man may be characterised as disharmony. Sin, ⁽²³⁵⁾ the collaborator (συνεργός) of death, first entered the souls of men and prepared the body for death (54). 'Thus, all flesh fell under sin, and every body under death, and every soul was expelled from its fleshly home' (55). The body returned to the earth, and the soul given by God was imprisoned in Hades, 'and there came about the dissolution of the beautiful harmony (καὶ λύσις ἐγένετο τῆς καλῆς ἁρμογῆς), and the beautiful body was divided (διαχωρίζετο). For man was divided by death (ὑπὸ τοῦ θανάτου μεριζόμενος . . . The image of the Father lay abandoned (ἔκειτο δὲ ἔργμος ἢ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκάν). ⁽²³⁶⁾ Man's predicament, then, is that through sin, death has laid hold of man and separated the soul from the body; man is divided in two. ⁽²³⁷⁾ 'This, then, is the reason why the mystery of the Passover (πάσχα) was accomplished (τετέλεσται) in the body of the Lord (56).

235. Melito clearly accepts the universality of sin, but shows no doctrine of original sin. See Perler, op. cit., p. 165.

236. Pasch. Hom. 55f. By the image of God, Melito clearly means the soul. Cf. Irenaeus, for whom the image is to be found in the flesh of man made by God (See below, pp. 620ff.

237. Melito's anthropology presupposes that man is bipartite, not tripartite. Cf. Irenaeus (See below, pp. 620ff.

From all this it is clear that the plan of salvation as understood by Melito is concerned with the redemption of man from the wretched division that had come to him as a result of his disobedience. There is no sign here of the idea found in Irenaeus that the plan of the Incarnation was inherent from the beginning in the creation of man in a childlike state.⁽²³⁸⁾ The plan in Melito arises solely from the Fall. Nevertheless, as can be seen in the final phrase of the section on the creation and fall of man, there is a connection between the fallen condition of man and the Incarnation; the mystery was accomplished 'in the body of the Lord'.

God's plan for the redemption of man is a plan of salvation history. The means by which the redemption is to be achieved is the Incarnation, but that cannot take place immediately; there must be a period of preparation for the great saving act. The history that leads up to the Incarnation is given a strong positive interpretation by Melito. 'That which is to be realised in a novel and magnificent manner, this is prepared long before (τοῦτο ἐκ μακροῦ προοικονομείται), so that when it happens, it may receive credence, having been prefigured long before (ἐκ μακροῦ προτυπωθέν)' (57). The preparation and the prefiguration are two-fold. On the one hand 'the salvation and truth of the Lord was prefigured (προετυπώθη) in the people, and the provisions of the gospel (τὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου

238. Cf. Irenaeus, (See below, p.635 on Dem. 12)

δόγματα) were proclaimed beforehand (προσκηρύχθη) by the Law' (39), and on the other hand 'the Lord had arranged beforehand (προεκονόμησεν) his own sufferings in the patriarchs and in the prophets and in the whole people, having sealed them (ἐπισφραγισάμενος) through the Law and the prophets' (57). Both salvation and suffering are prefigured in the history of the people of Israel. (239) We shall consider the theme of salvation first.

Towards the end of the Paschal Homily Melito upbraids the Israelites for their rejection of Christ in spite of all that Christ had done for them. Melito lists the work of Christ on Israel's behalf, beginning with creation. He continues:

He it was who chose (ὁ ἐκλεξάμενος) you and who guided (καθοδηγήσας) you from Adam to Noah, from Noah to Abraham, from Abraham to Isaac and Jacob and the twelve patriarchs. He it was who guided you into Egypt and protected you and consistently provided for you there. He it was who gave you light in a column (of fire), and covered you with a cloud, who divided the Red sea and led you through and scattered your enemy. He it was who gave you manna from heaven, who gave you to drink from the rock, who gave you the Law in Horeb, who gave you the inheritance of the (promised) land, who sent out to you the prophets,

239. On the technical language of typology in Melito see Perler, op. cit., pp. 29f. Some of the language he shares with Irenaeus. See Perler, op. cit., p. 152.

who raised up you kings. (240)

At this point, Melito turns to consider the rejection of Christ by the children of Israel in his earthly life. The whole history of the children of Israel is a history of Christ's dealings with them. It is Christocentric salvation history not only in that the history of Israel is seen as the events of God in history, and in this case the events of Christ the Word in history, but also in that a plan of God is being worked out in this salvation history. Christ through theophanies, through interventions on Israel's behalf, through prophets, was preparing for the salvation of man. All the activity of Christ is moving towards its fulfilment in the Incarnation.

The major event of the salvation history of Israel with which Melito is concerned is of course the Passover, which is described in detail (12 - 34), with particular emphasis on the slaying of the First-born (23 - 30). From this disaster Israel was protected by the blood of the lamb. The Angel of Death, however, did not spare Israel on account of the sacrifice of the sheep, or its death, or its blood, but because it saw 'the mystery of the Lord being accomplished in the sheep, the life of the Lord in the sacrifice of the sheep, the type (τύπος) of the Lord in the death of the sheep' (33). What is said of the Passover is true of the whole salvation history of the

Old Testament; its meaning is to be a prefiguration of the events to be enacted in the Incarnation. 'What was said and what happened are nothing apart from symbolic significance and plan drawn up beforehand (δίχα παραβολῆς καὶ προκευτήματος)' (35). For, as Melito goes on to say: 'This is what happens in the case of a model for a work of art (προκατασκευῇ). A work does not arise unless the future is seen by means of the image that is its type (διὰ τῆς τυπικῆς εἰκόνης).' (241) The saving events of the Old Testament, and in particular the Passover, are the model for the great saving event in Christ. By describing the past as a model Melito gives importance to the past; he does not deny that the events of Christ in Israel's past were important and very significant. (242)

241. Pasch. Hom. 36. The text of this passage is difficult, but the general meaning is clear. We have adopted the text as emended by Daniélou ('Figure et événement', p. 286). The two papyri are almost identical and presuppose the following text: τοῦτο δὲ γίνεται ἐπὶ προκατασκευῆς ἔργον οὐκ ἀνίσταται διὰ δὲ τὸ μέλλον διὰ τῆς τυπικῆς εἰκόνης ὁρᾶται. Perler adopts the emendations of Testuz and reads: εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ προκ. . . . ἀνίσταται. Ἡ οὖν τὸ μέλλον. . . etc. and makes the second sentence a question. Daniélou accepts the second emendation of Testuz (ἡ οὖν for διὰ δὲ), but retains the ms. reading at the beginning. Since this makes good sense with only moderate alteration we have followed it here.

242. See Daniélou, 'Figure et événement', pp. 289f., who rightly contrasts the attitude of Melito to the Old Testament with the attitudes of the author of the Epistle of Barnabas, of Justin Martyr, of Clement of

At the same time, however, the model has significance only while the reality is still unfulfilled. Once the thing for which it serves as a model has come into being the model ceases at once to have any value. Nevertheless type and reality both have their proper time: 'For to each thing its own time (ἐκάστῃ γὰρ ἴδιος χρόνος), for the type its own time (τοῦ τύπου ἴδιος χρόνος), for the material its own time (τῆς ὕλης ἴδιος χρόνος), for the truth its own time (τῆς ἀληθείας <ἴδιος χρόνος>)', (243). The whole process of salvation history is given significance in Melito by the way in which he sees the Christ-event's

242. (contd.) Alexandria and Origen even. 'C'est chez Irénée que nous trouverons une perspective analogue à celle de Méliton; mais justement elle paraît bien venir chez lui de ce dernier' (ibid., p. 290).

243. Pasch. Hom. 38. We accept the arguments of Danielou ('Figure et événement', pp. 287 - 89) and Wifstrand (art. cit., pp. 221f.) that ἴδιος χρόνος is to be added after τῆς ἀληθείας. The homoioteleuton of ἴδιος χρόνος after the first two genitive constructions suggests it, and, more especially, a little later Melito says that the work alone is loved, because 'in it alone you see the type (τύπον) and the material (ὕλην) and the truth (ἀληθείαν)' (Pasch. Hom. 38). On the linking here of καίρος with χρόνος, Daniélou comments: 'Nous y trouvons en effet pour la première fois rapprochées deux catégories qui existaient séparément dans le N.T., mais n'avaient jamais été unies et dont l'union dégage la loi de la théologie chrétienne de l'histoire' ('Figure et événement', p. 287).

having to be prepared for beforehand, so that it may gain acceptance when it occurs. It is prepared for by prefiguration and thus the reality of salvation history in the Old Testament period is never denied or ignored or regarded as simply the history of Israel's rebelliousness. Nevertheless it is no more than a model that, with the coming of Christ in the flesh and the establishing of the Church, ceases to have any importance. At the beginning of the Paschal Homily Melito emphasises this contrast between the old and the new in relation to the Passover and Christ: 'Thus the sacrifice of the sheep and the rite of the Passover (πάσχα) and the letter of the Law have given way to Christ Jesus (εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν κεχώρηκεν), for whose sake everything in the old Law occurred, and even more so in the new order (λόγος)' (6; cf. 1 - 5). Likewise the people of Israel have given way to the Church (39 - 45), and the Law has handed over its power to the gospel (42).

As well as the prefiguration of the salvation through Christ there is the prefiguration of the suffering of Christ. Foreshadowings of the treatment of Christ are seen in the killing of Abel, in the binding of Isaac, in the selling of Joseph, in the exposure of Moses, in the persecution of David, in the sufferings of the prophets on account of Christ (59; cf. 69). There are also predictions by the prophets of his sufferings (61 - 65). In this it is to be noted that Melito does not work with a negative damnation history alongside the salvation

history. He does not accuse the Israelites of always being rebellious. He complains of Israel's ingratitude, she has too lightly regarded the acts of Christ for her sake from creation right through to the work of Christ in his ministry, but her act of rebelliousness is to be seen in the killing of Christ. The sin of Israel is the slaying of Christ.⁽²⁴⁴⁾ For that Israel will be punished (93, 99); the gentiles have treated Christ better than his own people (92). There is behind this understanding of the sin of the Jews another important point about salvation history. The failure of the Jews is that they have fundamentally misunderstood their own history; they have not seen it as a model from which the salvation of man through Christ is to be constructed; they have refused to see it as of temporary importance only.

In the Incarnation, therefore, salvation history reaches its appointed climax. The model is obsolete, for the reality is now here. The reality which is Christ remains for Melito a paradox. Christ is both God and man. This he expresses forcefully in the introductory section of the Paschal Homily. Having said that the old has given way to the new, he proceeds to consider who Christ is, the Logos who displaces the Law:⁽²⁴⁵⁾

244. Pasch. Hom. 73 - 80, 86, 90.

245. Pasch. Hom. 7. Racle observes (art. cit., p. 402) that Logos in Melito does not so much signify the second person of the Trinity as the function of Christ for men; Christ is the Word who succeeds the Law.

For, brought forth as a son (ὥς γὰρ υἱὸς τεχθείς), and led as a lamb, and sacrificed as a sheep, and buried as a man, he rose from the dead as God, being by nature God and man (φύσει θεὸς ὢν καὶ ἄνθρωπος) (8).

Melito never speculates on how Christ can be both God and man, but he asserts the fact with great emphasis. The signs of the reality of Christ's two natures are there for all to see. His divinity is obvious from the miracles performed during his ministry; his humanity is obvious in the 30 years before his baptism 'in which he hid the signs of his divinity (ἀπέκρυβε τὰ σημεῖα τῆς αὐτοῦ θεότητος) by the imperfection inherent in the flesh (διὰ τὸ ἀτελὲς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα), although he was true God from eternity (καίπερ θεὸς ἀληθὴς προαιώνιος ὑπάρχων).²⁴⁶ The last phrase removes any possible hint of adoptionism. In fact so strongly is the paradox maintained that Melito does not hesitate to say that Christ continues to exercise his cosmological role even while on earth. At one and the same time 'he was standing before Pilate, and was seated with his Father' (Frag. XIV).

In one of the extant fragments of his other works, Melito considers the baptism of Jesus, but he does so not from the point of view of its significance for the person of Jesus, but from the point of view of combatting those who maintained that there was no reason why Jesus should have been baptised. On the contrary, argues Melito, if

246. Melito, Fr. VI; cf. whole fragment.

various metals are 'baptised' in the earth, and the heavenly bodies 'why should not the Christ be washed in the Jordan?' (Frag. VIII b 4).

Melito lists the deeds of Jesus during his ministry as examples of the love and abiding care that Christ had always shown to Israel. From the account of the work of Christ on Israel's behalf in the salvation history before the Incarnation, Melito passes straight on to the works of Jesus in his earthly life (82 - 86). At the same time, Melito's emphasis on Christ's works of love enables him to draw a sharp contrast to this in the treatment Christ received at the hands of the Jews. The very love which Christ showed to Israel was the reason for his suffering (72). Melito accuses Israel: 'His gifts to you were without price. But you rewarded him despicably with disgraces (Σὺ δὲ ἀτίμως ἀνταπέδωκας εἰς αὐτὸν τὰς ἀχαριστίας), recompensing him evil for good, and affliction for joy, and death for life' (90; cf. 79).

Even in the Passion, or rather, especially in the Passion Melito retains the tension of the paradox of Christ as God and man:

He who hung the earth is hanged (ὁ κρεμάσας τὴν γῆν κρέμεται). He who fixed the heavens has been fixed (ὁ πῆξας τοὺς οὐρανοὺς πέπηκεται). He who made all fast has been made fast on the tree (ὁ στηρίξας τὰ πάντα ἐπὶ ξύλου ἐστήρικται). The Master has been insulted (ὁ δεσπότης παρύβρισταί). God has been murdered (ὁ θεὸς πεφόνευσται). The King of Israel has been slain (ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἀνῆρεται) by an Israelite hand (96; cf. Frag. XIII).

The same tension can be seen in another passage, where also the whole event of the passion and resurrection is set in its perspective of salvation history. The sufferings of Christ are foreshadowed in the Old Testament and Melito again passes straight on to the sufferings of Christ, and also to the resurrection and ascension. The line is continuous from the prefiguration in Abel to the ascension. Christ's suffering is prefigured in the Old Testament and it is the same Christ 'who was incarnate in a virgin, who was hanged on a tree, who was buried in the earth, who was raised from the dead, who was taken up to the heights of the heavens' (70). Then the contrast is drawn. Although Christ was destined to suffer, he it is 'who was not broken on the tree, was not dissolved into earth (εἰς γῆν μὴ λυθεῖς), (247) (but) rose from the dead and raised man from the depths of the tomb (ἐκ τῆς κάτω τάφου)' (71). With the last sentence we turn to examine what was achieved by the Incarnation in God's purposes of salvation history.

Between the condition of man that requires redemption and the working out of redemption in the passion, death and resurrection of Christ there is a clear and precise connection, the major theme of which is suffering. The connection between this and the salvation history of the Old Testament is also plain. In the first place the sufferings of Christ are to be seen in the suffering of

247. When death slew man, man's body εἰς γῆν ἀνελύετο
(Pasch. Hom. 55).

various figures in the Old Testament, and also the activity of Christ for Israel is the model of his care and concern for suffering man in need of redemption. The connection is made explicit by Melito's interpretation of the word *πάσχα*. The great salvation-event of Israel contains in its name a reference to suffering, for *πάσχειν* is derived from *πάθ*⁽²⁴⁸⁾_{ειν}. In other words, the great salvation-events are not to be understood apart from their connection with suffering. The suffering of Christ in the great salvation-event receives its redemptive significance because it is a suffering with suffering mankind. The legacy which Adam passed on to his descendants when he fell was essentially a legacy of suffering. 'Learn, says Melito, therefore who is the one who suffers and who the one who suffers with the suffering one, and why the Lord came on earth: so that, having put on the suffering one (*τὸν πάσχοντα ἀμφιασόμενος*), he might carry him off (*ἄρπάσῃ*) to the heights of the heavens' (46f.). Christ came to put on the suffering one, and in this we see signs of the necessary connection between redemption and the Incarnation. The connection is made more explicit in another passage:

This is he who, having arrived on earth from heaven (*ἀφ' οὐρανόθεν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν*) on account of the suffering one, and having put that one on (*ἐνδυσάμενος*) through a virgin mother and come forth as man (*προελθὼν ἄνθρωπος*), took upon himself the sufferings of the suffering one through a body capable of suffering

248. Pasch. Hom. 46. On Melito's false etymology and its wide currency in the early Church see Perler, *op. cit.*, p. 159, and the references there.

and destroyed the sufferings of the flesh, and by means of the spirit which cannot die put to death the death that kills man (66).

It is an essential pre-requisite of redemption that Christ should have a body capable of suffering. More than just the suffering, Christ takes on the whole condition of fallen man. Being God and Lord, Christ is not subject to the conditions of suffering, fallen man, and by sharing in that condition, even to death on the cross, he triumphs over it and sets man free. Thus 'The Lord, having put on man, and having suffered for the suffering one, and having been bound for him who was held fast, and having been judged for him who was condemned, and having been buried for him who had been buried, rose from the dead and cried in a loud voice ' (100 f.; cf. Frag. XIII), and there follows a declaration by Christ of his triumph (101 - 3). Through the theme of suffering, therefore, fall and redemption are both linked to the salvation history of the Passover, in which the saving passion of Christ is prefigured.

Not only is man redeemed from suffering, he is saved from death as well. In the Fall, death brought about the division of man, the sundering of soul from body. Christ puts to death the death that kills man. Again this is linked with the Incarnation. 'For this reason the Father sent his Son from heaven without a body (*sine corpore*), so that, when he had become incarnate in the womb of the virgin and had been born as man, he might give life to man (*vivificaret hominem*) and gather his members, which

death had dispersed when it divided man' (Frag. XIII).

Christ must have a human body in order to heal the disastrous division in man. Death which kills man is itself put to death by the fact of the unity of Christ, the unity of the Spirit, which cannot die, with the body from the virgin (66). Hence both the redemption from suffering and the redemption from death are linked with the Incarnation, in that victory over both is won by Christ through his being true God and true man. (249) This does not mean that the victory takes place in the Incarnation. The suffering is overcome by the suffering on the cross and death is defeated when it cannot separate Christ's soul and body because Christ is Spirit that cannot die. (250) In

249. In this insistence on the reality of the Incarnation R. Cantalamessa ('Méliton de Sardes. Une christologie anti-agnostique du IIe siècle', in RevSR 37(1963), pp. 1 - 26) sees indications of the anti-agnostic character of Melito's theology.

250. In Pasch. Hom. 66 it is clear that the Spirit by which Christ puts to death the death that kills man is none other than Christ's divine nature. The section recounts Christ's descent from heaven and incarnation; as a result of his human nature he takes on the sufferings of suffering man, and through his divine nature puts death to death. This also illuminates the reference to the fact that the angel of death in the Exodus is intimidated not by the blood of the sheep but by the Spirit of the Lord (Pasch. Hom. 32). Death knew that he could not overcome the Divine Spirit that would become incarnate in Christ. The Christology is clearly presented in the form of a Spirit-Christology.

this teaching of Melito on the redemption of man from suffering and death we have something not entirely dissimilar from the doctrine of recapitulation in Irenaeus, though here it is not linked with the idea of man's growth. (251)

As a result of the work of Christ, man is now set free from the disastrous consequences of Adam's fall. Redemption, however, is not simply a matter of the original fall of Adam, for Melito reminds his hearers that Christ 'delivered us from the service of the world'; he 'unbound us from slavery to the devil'; he 'sealed (ἐσφράγισεν) our souls with his own Spirit and the members of the body with his own blood'; (252) 'He it is who delivered us from slavery

251. In Irenaeus the doctrine of recapitulation includes not only the disastrous effects of the Fall but also the themes of the image and likeness of God in man, which Christ manifests in their perfection in his Incarnation (See below, pp. 679ff.).

252. Pasch. Hom. 67. There is a clear reminiscence here of Baptism, and of the reception of the Spirit in baptism. There is insufficient evidence for proof, but it is tempting to see in the reference to the Spirit an indication of the way in which Melito thought about man's appropriation of the unity of body and soul won for him by Christ. In Irenaeus, the natural man is bipartite, but through the gift of the Spirit from Christ the tripartite man, body, soul and spirit, becomes capable of entering the kingdom of God. Without the Spirit this is impossible. In Melito's anthropology man is bipartite, but the reference here to the sealing of souls with the Spirit of Christ suggests an interpretation similar to the doctrine of Irenaeus. (On Irenaeus, see below, pp. 620ff.)

into freedom, from darkness into light, from death into life, from tyranny into an eternal kingdom' (68). In the closing pages of the work Christ himself calls all the families of men who are immersed (*πνευμαμέναι*) in sins to come and receive remission of sins (103). In the references to sealing with the Spirit and to the remission of sins there seem to be clear indications that baptism formed part of the Paschal feast.⁽²⁵³⁾ In the last passage referred to above, in which Christ himself speaks, an important point is raised in connection with salvation history. Whether or not Melito was thinking here in terms of an actual epiphany of Christ in the feast,⁽²⁵⁴⁾ it is clear that he by no means regarded salvation history as having ended with the resurrection. There is no vacuum between the resurrection and the consummation, for Christ continues to address men in the Church and call them to repentance. Christocentric salvation history is maintained in the life of the Church.

The events of salvation history beyond the resurrection are, however, no more than sketched by Melito, which is only to be expected since the Paschal Homily is preoccupied with the passion and its prefiguring. Nevertheless, there are some indications of the concluding stages

253. See Perler, op. cit., p. 25.

254. Cf. 'Une parousie anticipée (non visuelle, mais spirituelle), une présence du Messie ressuscité que les néophytes "avaient trouvé comme époux" par le baptême régénérateur, semble avoir été le point culminant de la liturgie quartodecimane' (Perler, op. cit., p. 200).

of the drama of salvation history. Melito makes a passing reference to the descensus of Christ and clearly regards it as part of Christ's victory, not primarily as a descent to free the righteous (102; cf. Frag. VIII b 4). The resurrection is referred to frequently.⁽²⁵⁵⁾ Melito stresses the fact that Israel was but a model for the Church, but he does not specify the role of the Church in the on-going salvation history (39 - 45). However, among the events listed as part of salvation history in one of the fragments (Frag. XV) is the appearance of Christ to the apostles, from which it is to be supposed that Melito regarded the founding of the Church as an essential part of salvation history, especially since the Church is the reality that supplants the type which Israel was. Christ rose from the dead and ascended to the heights of heaven,⁽²⁵⁶⁾ and in doing so he also raised man from the tomb (71) to the heights of heaven (47, 71, 102). This, however, does not mean that man has attained the goal of his salvation, or has received the resurrection already. Salvation history has not reached its appointed end, for Christ can still promise: 'It is I who lead you to the heights of the heavens. It is I who shall show you (ἐγὼ ὑμῖν δείξω) the Father (who is) from eternity (τὸν ἀπ' αἰώνων πατέρα). It is I who shall raise you (ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς ἀναστήσω) by my right hand' (103). The final goal in Melito as in

255. Pasch. Hom. 70, 71, 100, 105; Melito, Fr. XV.

256. Pasch. Hom. 70, 100; Melito, Fr. XV.

Irenaeus is the vision of the Father.⁽²⁵⁷⁾ Having ascended into heaven, Christ is seated in glory on the right hand of the Father,⁽²⁵⁸⁾ and to Christ is given the power to judge and to save all (104). If the movement of salvation history towards its goal lacks definition in detail, there is no denying that Melito sees it as progressing to its end, the vision of God.

The movement of salvation history in Melito is completely Christocentric. It begins with Christ in creation and ends with him in his granting the vision of the Father, and it passes through him in the Incarnation. The foundation for the events of salvation history is laid in the creation and fall of man. Man is made by God to live in happiness, but in his freewill man disobeyed God and fell into suffering and death. In the suffering and death are to be seen the themes that dominate in the salvation history and in the Incarnation. In the events of Israel's history Christ was preparing for the redemption of man by means of a model, and through the sufferings of the Old Testament figures was preparing for his own participation in the sufferings of man. In the Passover, salvation-event and suffering both combine, as they do again in the incarnate Christ. In Christ the suffering and death that held man fast are both undone and both

257. See below, pp. 666ff.

258. Pasch. Hom. 104, 105; Melito, Fr. XV.

demand that Christ should be truly man as well as truly God. As man he takes on himself the suffering and death of man, as God he triumphs over them and sets man free from them. Salvation history does not end with the resurrection but looks forward to its completion in the granting of the vision of the Father. In Melito, salvation history and Christology are inextricably bound up together; it is a truly Christocentric salvation history. It lacks some of the features found in Irenaeus, notably the idea of man's growth.⁽²⁵⁹⁾ Nevertheless, as a pattern it is clearly and concisely developed as a unified structure.

* * * * *

259. There can be no doubt of Irenaeus's indebtedness to Melito for some of the details of his theology and exegesis, but the overall picture is somewhat different. Both work with a scheme of Christocentric salvation history, but Irenaeus has developed the idea to a much greater degree, especially by means of the idea of man's development in which the Incarnation once again plays a crucial role as well as in the redemption of man from the disastrous results of the Fall. Grillmeier over-states the case when he says that Melito 'develops a view of salvation history as comprehensive as that of Irenaeus' (op. cit., p. 111).

PART THREE

VALENTINIAN

GNOSTICISM

CHAPTER SIX

VALENTINIAN SOURCES

I LITERARY SOURCES

Our major source of information about Valentinian Gnosticism is still the writings of the early Church Fathers, notably Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria and Epiphanius. Of these, the most important is Irenaeus both because he was the earliest to undertake a full-scale examination of Gnosticism that is still extant and because the later writers are to a greater or less degree dependent on him. However, the other writers do supply corroborating evidence and additional material, and, in the case of Epiphanius, part of the Greek text of Irenaeus's adversus haereses. Irenaeus regarded the teachings of the disciples of Valentinus as 'a recapitulation of all the heretics',⁽¹⁾ and he devotes the major part of his energies to the exposure and refutation of Valentinian doctrines. Irenaeus also claims personal knowledge of the disciples of Valentinus⁽²⁾ and of their writings;⁽³⁾ the disciples of Valentinus represent for him the greatest possible threat to the teachings of the Church.

The Valentinians were not a unified group with a single teaching. Hippolytus divides them into two major

1. adv. haer. IV pf. 2; H. ii 144.

2. adv. haer. I xiii 7; H. i 126; I pf. 2; H. i 4.

3. adv. haer. I pf. 2; H. i 4.

sections on the basis of their Christology: the Italian school and the Eastern school.⁽⁴⁾ As well as marked similarities there are also marked differences among all those who derive from Valentinus. Although Ptolemaeus was the one with whom Irenaeus was principally concerned, we shall have to consider here five Valentinian groups: Ptolemaeus, Heracleon, Theodotus and the Eastern School, Marcus Magus, and Valentinus himself. Ptolemaeus and Theodotus provide us with the major materials for the Western and Eastern schools respectively, Marcus and Heracleon shed light on various aspects of these schools, and from this an adequate understanding can be gained of Valentinus, in so far as that is possible, and also of the significance of the Christocentric salvation-drama in Valentinianism.

Material relating to Ptolemaeus comes from three main sources. The major source is the opening section of the adversus haereses of Irenaeus.⁽⁵⁾ The section is not a complete unity, for as well as the remarks of Irenaeus

4. Ref. VI 35.5 - 7.

5. adv. haer. I i 1 - viii 5; N. i 8 - 80. For this section we have used the Greek text of Epiphanius as emended by Sagnard and printed in his La gnose valentinienne et le témoignage de saint Irénée (Paris, 1947; - Études de philosophie médiévale 36), pp. 31 - 50, though there Sagnard does not give the text of adv. haer. I viii 5. An English translation is given in R.M. Grant, Gnosticism: An Anthology (London, 1961), pp. 163 - 83, and a relatively full selection in W. Foerster, Gnosis: A selection of Gnostic Texts, vol. 1, Patristic Evidence

himself⁽⁶⁾ it also contains references to the somewhat different and secondary form of the major system that is recorded by Hippolytus.⁽⁷⁾ It has become an accepted convention to refer to the major account in Irenaeus as theme A and to the major account in Hippolytus as theme B.⁽⁸⁾ In each writer there are traces of an awareness of the existence of the other theme than the one that forms the basis of his own account. In Irenaeus the exact delimitation of the two themes is not clear though disagreement centres on minor details only.⁽⁹⁾ It is the

5. (contd.) ET R. McL. Wilson (ed.) (Oxford, 1972), pp. 127 - 45.
6. adv. haer. I ii 3f.; H. i 16 - 18; I iii 6; H. i 30f.; I iv 2 - 4; H. i 35 - 38.
7. Ref. VI 29.2 - 36.3. Probable references to this system occur in Irenaeus's account at adv. haer. I ii 3; H. i 16; I ii 4; H. i 18; I v 4; H. i 46ff. While the account of Hippolytus closely resembles that of Irenaeus, it differs significantly at some points. It is acknowledged to be a later development of the Western Valentinian tradition and has therefore been excluded from the present study. See Sagnard, La gnose val., pp. 224 - 27, 234 - 37: 'le thème B (sc. the system dominant in Hippolytus) n'est que dérivé, postérieur, secondaire' (p. 237). Cf. C. Barth, Die Interpretation des Neuen Testaments in der valentinianischen Gnosis (Leipzig, 1911; = TU 37/3), pp. 26f. and K. Müller, 'Beiträge zum Verständnis der valentinianischen Gnosis', in Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse 1920 (Berlin, 1920), pp. 179 - 242, see p. 206.
8. The distinction was made originally by Lipsius and has

considered opinion of both Foerster⁽¹⁰⁾ and Sagnard that theme A is the system of Ptolemaeus.⁽¹¹⁾ In addition to

8. (contd.) been adopted by Barth, Müller, and generally by most recent writers on the subject.
9. E.g., at adv. haer. I iii 3; H. i 27f. in the exegesis of the pericope on the woman with a hemorrhage. W. Foerster (Von Valentin zu Herakleon. Untersuchungen über die Quellen und die Entwicklung der valentinianischen Gnosis, Giessen, 1928; = Beiheft 7 zu ZNTW), argued for the presence of influence from theme B (op. cit., pp. 50f.), but Sagnard disputes this (La gnose val., p. 152). The earlier attempts by G. Heinrici (Die valentinianische Gnosis und die heilige Schrift, Berlin, 1871) and E. de Faye (Gnostiques et Gnosticisme. Étude critique des documents du Gnosticisme Chrétien aux IIe et IIIe siècles, 2nd ed., Paris, 1925) to distinguish blocks of conflicting material from different sources in the major account of Irenaeus must be regarded as having failed, in the light of the work of Foerster and Sagnard.
10. Von Val. zu Her., p. 81.
11. The grounds on which this assertion is made may be summarised briefly as follows (see Sagnard, La gnose val., pp. 227 - 32): (1) In his preface to Book I of adv. haer. Irenaeus states that he will discuss the disciples of Valentinus with particular reference to the school of Ptolemaeus, and the source we are considering follows immediately.
(2) The exegesis of the Johannine Prologue in adv. haer. I viii 5; H. i 75 - 80 is ascribed to Ptolemaeus, and the system presupposed there is identical with the system of the section we are considering. In addition a number of distinctive features of the section make it certain that the author cannot possibly have been Valentinus, whose system appears to be more faithfully represented by the Eastern branch of Valentinianism whereas the present section is clearly Western. The

the Ptolemaean system Irenaeus provides a number of valuable examples of Ptolemaean exegesis.⁽¹²⁾ We possess a second source that, in part, closely follows this theme A. This is the Excerpta ex Theodoto 43.2 - 65,⁽¹³⁾ which is parallel to adv. haer. I iv 5 - vii 5; The two sources are not identical, but complement each other, though clearly stemming from the same original document.⁽¹⁴⁾ The third

11. (contd.) author was not Valentinus and was very probably Ptolemaeus.
12. adv. haer. I i 3; H. i 11f.; I iii 1 - 5; H. i 24 - 30; I viii 1 - 5; H. i 66 - 80.
13. The following editions of the work have been used: The Excerpta ex Theodoto of Clement of Alexandria, edited with translation, introduction and notes by R.P. Casey (London, 1934; = Studies and Documents 1); Clément d'Alexandrie Extraits de Théodote. Text grec, Introduction, traduction et notes par F. Sagnard (Paris, 1948; = Sources Chrétiennes 23). An English translation of a full selection of this section of the Excerpta is given in Foerster, Gnosis I, pp. 146 - 53.
14. That one and the same document underlies both accounts was convincingly demonstrated by O. Dibelius, 'Studien zur Geschichte der Valentinianer', in ZNTW 9(1908), pp. 230 - 47, see pp. 230 - 42. Cf. also Barth, *op. cit.*, pp. 11 - 21, who appears to reach the same conclusions independently of Dibelius. Dibelius's conclusions have been endorsed by Müller (*art. cit.*, p. 206), Casey (*op. cit.*, pp. 8f.) and Sagnard (Extraits, p. 28). Foerster was of the opinion that the source in Clement began at section 29 and ended at 68 (*op. cit.*, p. 85). This led him to find greater differences between the accounts in Clement and Irenaeus in respect of the origin of Christ, the nature of the Demiurge and the practice of Baptism, but Foerster has abandoned this position (NTS 6(1959-60), p. 16 n.1). Casey regards the limits of the

source is a document that is acknowledged as a genuine work of Ptolemaeus - his Letter to Flora.⁽¹⁵⁾ The letter does not set out an account of the system in the form of a salvation-drama, but the ideas are pre-supposed,⁽¹⁶⁾ and from the point of view of the present study the work has particular value for the light it sheds on Ptolemaeus's attitude to the Old Testament.

There is a close similarity between the system of Ptolemaeus and the system of Heracleon.⁽¹⁷⁾ Heracleon does

14. (contd.) source as Excerpta 42 - 65, and tentatively includes with this section Excerpta 6 and 7 (op. cit., pp. 8f.).
15. The following edition has been used: Ptolémée. Lettre à Flora. Texte Traduction et Introduction de G. Quispel (Paris, 1949; = Sources Chrétiennes 24). The work is cited by the subdivisions of Epiphanius, Panarion 33.3 - 7. Quispel's introduction (op. cit., pp. 7 - 40) is identical with his article, 'La lettre de Ptolémée à Flora', in VC 2 (1948), pp. 17 - 56. An English translation is given in Foerster, Gnosis I, pp. 155 - 61.
16. That the work does not give a complete account of the system of Ptolemaeus is to be expected since it was directed to an inquirer and not to an initiate. On the similarity of the system pre-supposed to the opening section in Irenaeus adv. haer. see Foerster, op. cit., pp. 81 - 85, and Sagnard, La gnose val., pp. 451 - 79.
17. This has been well demonstrated by both Foerster and Sagnard. After a detailed study of the fragments of Heracleon and a thorough, though not so detailed, study of the theme A in Irenaeus, Foerster came to the following conclusion: that 'beide Fassungen des valentinianischen Systems sind so nahe miteinander verwandt, dass die beiderseitigen Aussagen zur gegen-

not give us a straightforward account of his system, but it can be re-constructed from his exegesis of passages of the New Testament, principally of course from his comments on the Gospel according to John that have been preserved by Origen. (18)

For Theodotus our principal source is Clement of Alexandria's Excerpta ex Theodoto. For a number of reasons this work does not permit a straight-forward analysis. In the first place it is a collection of excerpts and not a

17. (contd.) seitigen Deutung benutzt werden können' (Von Val. zu Her., p. 81). Foerster begins his study of Valentinianism with Heracleon (ibid., pp. 3 - 44) on the grounds that (1) it is only right to study the Valentinians, at least initially, from their own writings, and (2) Heracleon's fragments were at that time the only Valentinian material extant that provided a sufficiently broad foundation on which to work (ibid., pp. 1 - 3). Sagnard (La gnose val., pp. 480 - 520) accepts the conclusion of Foerster as sufficiently well established to be able to serve as a basis for his own attempt 'de dégager le sens profond, la ligne essentielle, de cet "enseignement".' (ibid., p. 481).
18. The edition of the Fragments that has been used is that by A.E. Brooke, The Fragments of Heracleon (Cambridge, 1891; = Texts and Studies I/4). The fragments are cited according to the numbering of Brooke, and, in the case of the longer fragments, also by the line in Brooke's edition. Use has also been made of the article of Y. Janssens ('Heracleon. Commentaire sur l'évangile selon saint Jean', in Le Muséon 72(1959), pp. 101 - 51, 277 - 99) in which an attempt is made to present the work of Heracleon separated from the polemical remarks of Origen. An English translation of the fragments is given in Foerster, Gnosis I, pp. 162 - 83.

connected account, and, more important, the work contains other material than the work of Theodotus. The full title is: Extracts from the Works of Theodotus and the so-called Eastern School in the Time of Valentinus. It is possible, in fact, to discern at least four strands of tradition in the work. In the first place there are the comments of Clement himself to be found chiefly in the earlier sections of the work.⁽¹⁹⁾ A second strand is to be found in excerpts 43.2 - 65, which are parallel to Irenaeus, adv. haer. I iv 5 - vii 5. The remainder of the Excerpta ex Theodoto may be further divided into two strands, that which stems from Theodotus himself and that which stems from the Valentinians without being attributed to a single teacher.⁽²⁰⁾ Clearly

19. The Clementine sections are fairly readily identified, first by personal remarks of Clement (1.3; 8.1; 17.3; 20; 24.2; 30.1; 33.2), by the necessary logical context of these passages, by parallels in thought and language with Clement's other works, by non-Valentinian ideas and expressions, and by visible sutures (See Sagnard, Extraits, p. 9). The primary study on the Clementine content of the work was done by Dibelius (art. cit., pp. 242 - 47), and his conclusions were reinforced and slightly extended by Casey (op. cit., pp. 9 - 16) and Sagnard (Extraits, pp. 8 - 21). As a result the following sections may confidently be assigned to Clement: Exc. ex Theod. 1.3; 4f.; 8 - 15; 17.2 - 20; 24.2; 27; 33.2. In addition there are brief comments of Clement in 30 and 31.1. Probably 7.3c - 4 and 23.4 also stem from Clement; 86 may, but probably does not, stem from Clement.

20. Again the process of distinction is relatively easy. There are five passages specifically assigned to Theodotus (Exc. ex Theod. 22.7; 26.1; 30.1; 32.2; 35.1).

it would be possible to discuss the system of Theodotus without reference to the excerpts from other Valentinians of the Eastern School, but since there is a very close similarity between the teachings of Theodotus and the Eastern School in general, they may be considered together.

Marcus Magus gave to Valentinian Gnosticism a complex interpretation by means of letters and numbers. Irenaeus devotes a lengthy section of Book I of his adversus haereses to an account of the Marcosians.⁽²¹⁾ In I xiii (H. i 114 - 27) he describes the practices of the Marcosians as he himself knew them in the Rhone valley. From I xiv 1 - xvi 3 (H. i 127 - 64) Irenaeus gives an account of the numerical system of Marcus, interspersed with some comments of his own.⁽²²⁾ Clearly Irenaeus considers Marcus in this detail

20. (contd.) To these may be added passages introduced by the singular $\phi\eta\sigma\iota$ (Exc. ex Theod. 1.1; 22.1; 25.2; 38.2; 41.1; 67.1) which, on examination, show similarities with the group above. These passages provide a base sufficiently broad to give the characteristics of Theodotus's own theology, and, as a result, it is probable that the following sections introduced by the plural $\phi\alpha\sigma\iota$ should be included in any list of the parts of the Excerpta specifically assigned to Theodotus (Exc. ex Theod. 22.4; 36.1; 41.2; 79). It should be observed as well that references to Theodotus and to the other Valentinian sources of Clement occur regularly throughout the work with the notable exception of the section 43.2 - 65 (i.e. the section parallel to adv. haer. I iv 5 - vii 5). See further Sagnard, Extraits, pp. 30 - 32.
21. An English translation of a relatively full selection from the appropriate sections of adversus haereses is given in Foerster, Gnosis I, pp. 200 - 21.
22. adv. haer. I xv 4 - 6; H. i 152 - 56; xvi 3; H. i 162 - 64.

because his followers were well known in the Rhone valley.

As source material for Valentinus himself we must rely on a few fragments and a brief outline by Irenaeus. (23)
There are nine extant fragments attributed to Valentinus, preserved mainly in Clement of Alexandria's Stromateis. (24)
The fragments of Valentinus are to some extent enigmatic, but in the light of the other Valentinian systems they can be made to yield sense and to make plain certain aspects of the original thought of Valentinus. (25)

23. adv. haer. I xi 1; H. i 98 - 101. Attractive though the reconstruction is, the attempt of G. Quispel to establish the original doctrine of Valentinus ('The Original Doctrine of Valentine', in VC 1(1947), pp. 43 - 73) does not provide a secure base from which to work, partly because of a lack of supporting evidence, partly because such an endeavour must work in the main with the accounts of the Church Fathers about the disciples of Valentinus, or even the disciples of the disciples in some cases, and partly because, given the fragmentary remnants of Valentinus's own works, any reconstruction must of necessity involve much subjective judgement.
24. The text used is from that printed by A. Hilgenfeld. Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums, urkundlich dargestellt (Leipzig, 1884) and from the editions of the primary sources as indicated in the notes. Departures from the edited text are noted at the appropriate point. The fragments are referred to by the number assigned them by Hilgenfeld, by the page number in Hilgenfeld, and the reference to the primary source. Use has also been made of the English translation in Foerster, Gnosis I, pp. 241 - 43.
25. See Foerster, Von Val. zu Her., pp. 91 - 97 and Sagnard, La gnose val., pp. 121 - 26, 559 - 61. If the fragments provide an insufficient base from which to begin, there

From this material culled from the writings of the Church Fathers we may gain a fairly detailed picture of Valentinianism as it existed in its various forms about the time it was attacked by Irenaeus. However, the discovery in 1945 or 1946 in Upper Egypt of a jar containing some thirteen papyrus codices in Coptic has given a new impetus to the study of Gnosticism.⁽²⁶⁾ Of the 53 tractates contained in the find only a handful can be said to show signs of Valentinian provenance.⁽²⁷⁾ Even of these, only one work

25. (contd.) is another danger that must be faced, of reading them in the light of what we know from elsewhere about Valentinianism and running the risk of reading into them what is not present in the text.
26. For general surveys of the find and its contents see, e.g., H.C. Puech, 'Les nouveaux écrits gnostiques découverts en Haute-Egypte', in Coptic Studies in Honour of Walter Ewing Crum (Boston, 1950), pp. 91 - 154; J. Doresse, The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics. An Introduction to the Gnostic Coptic Manuscripts discovered at Chenoboskion (ET, London, 1960); W.G. van Unnik, Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings. A preliminary survey of the Nag Hammadi find (London, 1960; = SBT 30). A comprehensive bibliography up to 1969 is given by D.M. Scholer, Nag Hammadi Bibliography 1948 - 1969 (Leiden, 1971; = Nag Hammadi Studies I), with annual supplements in Novum Testamentum.
27. The Nag Hammadi tractates are by no means of a homogeneous character. They include works from such diverse origins as Valentinian Gnosticism, Barbelo-gnostic groups and Hermetic tractates. See further, e.g. H.C. Puech, 'The Jung Codex and the other Gnostic Documents from Nag Hammadi', in The Jung Codex. A Newly Recovered Gnostic Papyrus, ed. F.L. Cross (London, 1955), pp. 11 - 34, esp. pp. 20 - 24.

appears to offer a fairly coherent salvation-drama: The Tripartite Tractate. Three further works clearly of Valentinian origin, The Gospel of Philip, The Gospel of Truth and The Treatise on the Resurrection, add valuable material to a consideration of the Christocentric salvation-drama in Valentinian Gnosticism. Other works, e.g. The Gospel of Thomas and The Apocryphon of James, provide some parallels to Valentinian thought but do not merit major consideration here. (28)

28. In respect of both these works the term "Valentinian" requires considerable qualification. Indeed, with regard to the Gospel of Thomas even the term 'gnostic' requires some qualification. Cf. 'Granted that the gospel as it now stands can be read as a Gnostic document, does this mean that it was Gnostic from the first, that it was composed by a Gnostic and with the full Gnostic theory present to his mind? Or would we not consider, here as in other respects, the possibility that a document originally non-Gnostic has been taken over, adapted and embellished, to serve a Gnostic purpose?' (R.McL. Wilson, Gnosis and the New Testament, Oxford, 1968, p. 94). On the Gnostic element in the work cf. R.M. Grant and D.N. Freedman, The Secret Sayings of Jesus (London, 1960); R.McL. Wilson, Studies in the Gospel of Thomas (London, 1960), pp. 14 - 44; E. Haenchen, Die Botschaft des Thomas-Evangeliums (Berlin, 1961). There are, however, some Valentinian echoes that will be noted in due course. See further, e.g., H.E.W. Turner, 'The Gospel of Thomas: its History, Transmission and Sources', in Thomas and the Evangelists, ed. H.E.W. Turner and Hugh Montefiore (London, 1962; = SBT 35), pp. 11 - 40, esp. pp. 19 - 22, and above all B. Gärtner, The Theology of the Gospel of Thomas (London, 1961), who stresses the resemblances between the Gospel of Thomas and the Gospel of Truth, and concludes that if

n.28. (contd.) the latter is to be regarded as Valentinian, so ought also the former (op. cit., p. 272). References to the Gospel of Thomas are to the sayings as numbered in The Gospel according to Thomas, A. Guillaumont, H.C. Puech, G. Quispel, W. Till, Yassah 'abd al Masih (edd.) (Leiden/London, 1959).

With regard to the Apocryphon of James, caution is also necessary. In a preliminary analysis of the Jung Codex, Puech and Quispel ('Les écrits gnostiques du Codex Jung', in VC 8(1954), pp. 1 - 51, esp. pp. 7 - 22) considered that the various arguments could lead only to a probability that the work is Valentinian: 'Mais une probabilité assez forte pour nous conduire personnellement à presumer que la Lettre est une composition gnostique, de provenance vraisemblablement valentinienne' (art. cit., pp. 21f.). Cf. also Quispel in ZRGG 6(1954), pp. 291f.; id., in The Jung Codex, pp. 45 - 47; Puech, in NTA I, pp. 333 - 38. W.C. van Unnik challenged this and argued that the work 'originates from a small village-church not yet affected by gnosticism, between 125 - 150 as a word of exhortation to seek the way of the kingdom by salvation as Jesus gave it' ('The Origin of the recently discovered "Apocryphon Jacobi"', in VC 10(1956), pp. 149- 56, quotation from p. 156) The country of origin is Egypt. van Unnik found support for the non-Gnostic character of the work from E. Haenchen ('Literatur zum Codex Jung', in ThR 30(1964), pp. 47f.). On the other hand, J. Zandee has demonstrated that in a number of features the Apocryphon of James shows traits that are undeniably Gnostic. Thus, in the work, themes such as secrecy, fullness, drunkenness, sickness, gnosis, the pure man of light, are used in typically Gnostic fashion, and in the term 'Son of Man', in the anthropology and in the idea of the pre-existent pneumatics the Gnosticism can be more closely defined as Valentinianism (J. Zandee, 'Gnostische Trekken in een Apocryphe Brief van Jacobus', in Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift 17(1962 -63), pp. 401 - 22). The introduction

The Gospel of Truth is the second work of the Jung Codex, (29) Originally written in Greek, it is extant in a

28. (contd. 2) to the editio princeps of the work (Epistula Iacobi Apocrypha. Codex Jung F. I^r - F. VIII^v (p. 1 - 16)), ediderunt M. Malinine, H.C. Puech, G. Quispel, W. Till, R. Kasser, adiuvantibus R.McL. Wilson, J. Zandee (Zürich und Stuttgart, 1968) reflects the caution introduced by the views of van Unnik and Zandee, and, while acknowledging that van Unnik has shown that some of the evidence for a Gnostic provenance of the document must be set in a wider context, the editors follow Zandee in seeing some of the themes of the work as undeniably Gnostic. However, in the light of the observations of A. Orbe (cited by the editors of the editio princeps), the term 'Valentinian' requires some strong qualification, for the attitude to martyrdom adopted in the work (i.e., seeking it) is diametrically opposed to the attitude commonly held by the Valentinians (op. cit., pp. XXIV - XXX). H.M. Schenke ('Der Jakobusbrief aus dem Codex Jung', in OLZ 66(1971), cols. 117 - 30), on the basis of the scanty evidence available, maintains that the work was addressed to Cerinthus the Gnostic by a disciple of his and 'es hätte also doch so etwas sie ein Evangelium (wenn auch nicht des Kerinth, so doch) der Kerinthianer gegeben' (col. 119). In the light of this, there is ample justification for not treating the work as a major document of Valentinian Gnosticism, though reference will be made to it at appropriate points.
29. The following edition has been used: Evangelium Veritatis. Codex Jung f. VIII^v - XVI^v (p. 16 - 32) / f. XIX^r - XXII^r (p. 37 - 43) ediderunt M. Malinine, H.C. Puech, G. Quispel, (Zürich, 1956; = Studien aus dem C.G Jung-Institut, VI), and Evangelium Veritatis (Supplementum). Codex Jung F. XVII^r - F. XVIII^r (p. 33 - 36) ediderunt M. Malinine, H.C. Puech, G. Quispel, W. Till (Zürich

Coptic translation, in the Subakhmimic dialect.⁽³⁰⁾ The work is not a gospel in the literary sense of that word as it is applied to the canonical gospels; rather the work is in the form of a meditation or homily on the good news of salvation.⁽³¹⁾ Some scholars have identified the work with

29. (contd.) und Stuttgart, 1961; = Studien aus dem C.G. Jung-Institut Zürich, VI). In addition to the translations in the above edition the following translations have been consulted: K. Grobel, The Gospel of Truth: A Valentinian Meditation on the Gospel: Translation from the Coptic and Commentary (London, 1960); W.W. Isenberg, in R.M. Grant (ed.), Gnosticism. An Anthology, pp. 146 - 61; W.C. Till, 'Das Evangelium der Wahrheit: Neue Übersetzung des vollständigen Textes', in ZNTW 50(1959), pp. 165 - 85; and J.E. Ménard, L'Évangile de Vérité (Leiden, 1972; = Nag Hammadi Studies II).
30. The case advanced by G. Fecht that the Coptic is the original ('Der erste "Teil" des sogenannten Evangelium Veritatis (S 16.31 - 22.20)', in Orientalia 30(1961), pp. 371 - 90; 31(1962), pp. 85 - 119; 32(1963), pp. 298 - 335), must be regarded as having failed; that advanced by P. Nagel that the original language was Syriac ('Die Herkunft des Evangelium Veritatis in sprachlicher Sicht', in OLZ 61(1966), pp 5 - 14) deserves consideration at least to the extent that the work may come from Syria. See E. Haenchen, art. cit., pp. 68 - 73; A. Böhlig, 'Zur Ursprache des Evangelium Veritatis', in Le Muséon 79(1966), pp. 317 - 33; J. Ménard, 'La structure et la langue originale de l'Évangile de Vérité', in RevSR 44(1970), pp. 128 - 37; id., L'Évangile de Vérité, pp. 9 - 17; K. Rudolph, art. cit., ThR 34(1969), pp. 201 - 04.
31. The original opinion of Puech and Quispel ('Les écrits gnostiques du Codex Jung', in VC 8(1954), p. 23) that the work was intended as a 'fifth gospel' to complement

the Valentinian Gospel of Truth mentioned by Irenaeus. (32)

31. (contd.) or supplement the four canonical gospels has been abandoned in favour of the opinion first advanced by W.C. van Unnik ('The "Gospel of Truth" and the New Testament', in The Jung Codex, pp. 104 - 05) that the work is 'a sermon or meditation rather than a writing which belongs to the same category as our familiar Gospels' (p. 106, Cf. Puech, in NTA I, p. 240). Attempts have been made to be more precise about the locus in which the homily was delivered. T. Sæve-Söderbergh (cited by Segelberg) regards it as a baptismal homily; E. Segelberg ('Evangelium Veritatis - a Confirmation Homily and its Relation to the Odes of Solomon', in Orientalia Suecana 8(1959), pp. 1 - 42) regards it, as his title suggests, as a confirmation homily. See also S. Arai, Die Christologie des Evangelium Veritatis. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung, (Leiden, 1964), p. 14, who accepts that it could serve as a baptismal homily.
32. The evidence has been considered many times. Irenaeus (adv. haer. III xi 9; H. ii 52) states that the Valentinians boast of having more gospels than there in fact are, including a recently written work entitled 'Veritatis Evangelium', a work that 'in no way agrees with the gospels of the apostles'. The identification of this work mentioned by Irenaeus with The Gospel of Truth has been accepted by many scholars with greater or less degrees of caution. The identification has been rejected, however, by J. Leipoldt (TLZ 82(1957), cols. 825 - 34) on the ground that 'the Gospel of Truth' is not the title of the work but its incipit. H.M. Schenke, in his Die Herkunft des sogenannten Evangelium Veritatis (Göttingen, 1959), pp. 13f., also rejects the notion that Valentinus was the author. On the use of the incipit as a title (a practice that was fairly widespread in the ancient world) see e.g., H. Jonas, in

Whether or not this is accepted, the Valentinian character of the work cannot be seriously disputed,⁽³³⁾ and it has

32. (contd.) Studia Patristica VI = TU 81 (Berlin, 1962), pp. 96f.; J. Munck, 'Evangelium Veritatis and Greek Usage as to Book Titles', in StTh 17(1963), pp. 133 - 38; J. Ménard, in Rev.SR 44(1970), p. 131. The evidence in fact will support no more than the negative conclusion that the Gospel of Truth cannot be proved not to be the work mentioned by Irenaeus (See W. Dunn, in VC 15(1961), pp. 160 - 64). The situation is no different with regard to the statement of Pseudo-Tertullian (adv. omn. haer. 4) that Valentinus 'evangelium habet etiam suum praeter haec nostra'.
33. On account of the presence in the Gospel of Truth of a number of typically Valentinian terms (see, e.g., the editio princeps, pp. XII ff., Grobel, op. cit., pp. 16 - 25) and because several expressions in the Gospel of Truth are similar to expressions in other Valentinian works (see, e.g., Puech and Quispel, in VC 8(1954), pp. 27 - 31, and the references below) most scholars regard the Gospel of Truth as of Valentinian origin (cf. also: Leipoldt, in TLZ 82(1957), cols. 825 - 34; Wilson, Gnosis and the New Testament, p. 90; id., in NTS 9(1962-63), pp. 295 - 98; Robison, in JR 43(1963), pp. 234 - 43). Hans Jonas even sees the same Valentinian myth present in the Gospel of Truth as in some other Valentinian sources (in Gnomon 32 1960), pp. 327 - 35; cf. Studia Patristica VI (Berlin, 1962; = TU 81), pp. 96 - 111; See also H. Ringgren, 'The Gospel of Truth and Valentinian Gnosticism', in StTh 18(1964), pp. 51 - 65). However, 'Valentinian' requires qualification, for some of the characteristic features of our other Valentinian sources are absent from the Gospel of Truth, notably the thirty Aeons with their names, the entire Sophia-myth, the Demiurge, and the classification of men into three groups. As a result of this, some scholars have rejected the

even been maintained by some that it is the work of Valentinus himself. (34)

33. (contd.) description of the Gospel of Truth as 'Valentinian'. In particular, Schenke has attempted to prove a relationship between the Gospel of Truth and the Odes of Solomon (op. cit., pp. 20 - 29; cf. also Haardt, in Theologie und Philosophie 42(1967), pp. 390 - 401). But there again there are a number of marked differences (see esp. J.E.Ménard, L'Évangile de Vérité: Rétroversion grecque et commentaire (Paris, 1962); Segelberg, art. cit.; Arai, op. cit., pp. 12f.; E. Haenchen, (art. cit., pp. 64 - 68), notes the marked differences between the Gospel of Truth and other Valentinian sources, but does not follow Schenke in seeing a relationship with the Odes of Solomon). In short, 'though developed Valentinianism is different from the doctrine of "The Gospel of Truth" there are eons, and already behind "The Gospel of Truth" may be discerned the quasi-rationalistic spirit which seeks to describe the indescribable and explain the inexplicable; or rather, perhaps to tell the truth about the origin of the universe in mythological form.' (C.K. Barrett, 'The Gospel of Truth. The Editio Princeps of an Ancient Gnostic Text', in ExpT 69(1957 - 58), pp. 167 - 70, quotation from p. 170). See also below, pp.
34. The evidence that Valentinus himself was the author depends on the interpretation of the evidence advanced in the two preceding notes, in conjunction with the known facts of the life of Valentinus. The Gospel of Truth is then regarded as the work mentioned by Irenaeus, and the absence of certain characteristic Valentinian features is to be explained by the fact that the Gospel of Truth was an early work of Valentinus. The theory is attractive (see van Unnik, in The Jung Codex, pp. 94 - 101, 104, and Grobel, op. cit., p. 26), but is quite incapable of final proof. One original piece of evidence

An edition of the entire Tripartite Tractate is still in preparation. The work is the longest of those in the Jung Codex.⁽³⁵⁾ Part one of the work is now published⁽³⁶⁾ and a number of minor sections from part two are available from other sources.⁽³⁷⁾ From the descriptions of the work in an article by Puech and Quispel and in Quispel's contribution to The Jung Codex⁽³⁸⁾ it is apparent that this treatise when fully accessible will provide a major

34. (contd.) has had to be abandoned (that the method of finger-counting in Ev. Ver. 32.4 - 9 was a purely Western phenomenon) (See H.I. Marrou, in VC 12(1958), pp. 98 - 103), and neither Irenaeus nor Pseudo-Tertullian says that the Valentinians actually wrote the work used by them (see Haenchen, in ThR 30(1964), pp. 63f.).
35. The work occupies pp. 51 - 140 of the Jung Codex, almost two-thirds of the entire codex.
36. Tractatus Tripartitus Pars I De Supernis. Codex Jung F. XXVI^r - F. LII^v (p. 51 - 104), ediderunt R. Kasser, M. Malinine, H.C. Puech, G. Quispel, J. Zandee, adiuvantibus W. Vycichl, R. McL. Wilson (Bern, 1973).
37. The frontispiece of The Jung Codex is a plate of p. 116 of the text. Other short passages are accessible in translation in articles by J. Zandee ('Gnostic Ideas on the Fall and Salvation', in Numen 11(1964), pp. 13 - 74) and R. Kasser ('Les subdivisions du Tractatus Tripartitus', in Le Muséon 82(1969), pp. 101 - 21, see p. 117), and in J. Zandee, The Terminology of Plotinus and of Some Gnostic Writings, mainly the Fourth Treatise of the Jung Codex (Leiden, 1961).
38. Puech and Quispel 'Le quatrième écrit gnostique du Codex Jung', in VC 9(1955), pp. 65 - 102; and Quispel, 'The Jung Codex and its Significance', in The Jung Codex, pp. 37 - 78.

first-hand source for Valentinian speculation.⁽³⁹⁾ It has been described as 'a large-scale dogmatic dissertation, a vast exposition of theology written in didactic and systematic form'.⁽⁴⁰⁾ So far as content is concerned, the work 'contains the whole of the Valentinian thought-world, beginning with a description of the Transcendent God and ending with the *ἡ ποικίλη καταστάσις*'.⁽⁴¹⁾ The treatise can be divided into three parts:⁽⁴²⁾ I, De Supernis; II, De Creatione Hominis; III, De Generibus Tribus. Part one, now published is concerned with the being of God, the structure of the Pleroma and the Fall. Although this is of great importance for use in conjunction with the material from Ptolemaeus etc., it is unfortunate that this is all we have at present, for Quispel has given one or two tantalising glimpses of the later part of the work, which suggest its profound significance for our present theme. Quispel writes as follows:

The author gives an allegorical explanation of the creation of Adam and his Fall and ensuing death, after which follows a description of the process of history. Three phases are distinguished: the hylic or Greek, the psychic or Jewish, and the pneumatic

39. Cf. 'Le "Traité sur les trois natures" est, on s'en rendra compte, un document à certains égards capital pour la connaissance du Valentinisme et pour l'histoire des spéculations gnostiques tout aussi bien que de la théologie chrétienne' (Puech/Quispel, 'Le quatrième écrit', p. 69).

40. *ibid.*, p. 65.

41. Zandee, *art. cit.*, *Numen* 11(1964), p. 16.

42. Kasser, *art. cit.*, *Le Muséon* 82(1969).

or Christian which forms the crowning of the world process... . . . The Redeemer brings liberation from slavery and reveals the destiny of the three classes into which mankind is divided The writer then gives us a long description of the eschatological destiny of these three classes. Thus our writing includes an explanation of the origin of mankind and the world, of the course of history and the passage of the Spirit through the inferno of paganism, the purgatorio of religion and morality to the paradise of pure spirituality when the Spirit shall have ascended above the steps from the Pleroma and live eternally in God. (43)

Here perhaps we may see that the distinction between salvation history and salvation drama is by no means absolute. The Tripartite Tractate is indisputably Valentinian and it has been suggested that its author may have been Heracleon. (44)

43. Quispel in The Jung Codex, pp. 59f.

44. Puech and Quispel regarded it as 'indubitable que ce nouvel inédit émane du gnosticisme valentinien' (Le quatrième écrit, VC 9(1955), p. 70) and this has not been challenged. As regards the question of authorship the same scholars have made a good case for Heracleon as the author of the Tripartite Tractate (*ibid.*, pp. 69 - 71, 100 - 102), but until the whole tractate can be examined this must remain in the field of probability rather than certainty. Kasser (*art. cit.*, p. 102) maintains that 'saint Irénée semble avoir connu tout ce texte et l'avoir décrit comme étant un seul traité' (cf. also the editio princeps, p. 9). Kasser gives no evidence for Irenaeus's knowledge of the work, and, as a result of the researches of Foerster and Sagnard, it has been with Ptolemaeus not Heracleon that Irenaeus has been associated. Kasser

The Gospel of Philip is the third tractate of Codex II of Nag Hammadi, coming immediately after the Gospel of Thomas.⁽⁴⁵⁾ The work without doubt belongs in the category of Valentinian Gnosticism, and affinities between the Gospel of Philip and the Marcosian system suggest that it belongs more in the Eastern Valentinian group, though certainty is impossible on this point.⁽⁴⁶⁾ Although Schenke

44. (contd.) even seems to associate the work with the major account by Irenaeus in adv. haer. I i - viii (Kasser, art. cit., p. 115), but again no evidence is cited.
45. The following editions and translations have been used. For the Coptic Text: J.E. Ménard, L'Évangile selon Philippe. Introduction Texte Traduction Commentaire (Strasbourg, 1967). Additional translations: H.M. Schenke, 'Das Evangelium nach Philippus. Ein Evangelium der Valentinianer aus dem Funde von Nag-Hamadi', in TLZ 84(1959), cols. 1 - 26; C.J. de Catanzaro, 'The Gospel according to Philip', in JTS n.s. 13(1962), pp. 35 - 71; R.McL. Wilson, The Gospel of Philip, translated from the Coptic text, with an Introduction and Commentary (London, 1962); Y. Janssens, 'L'Évangile selon Philippe', in Le Muséon 81(1968), pp. 79 - 133; R. Kasser, 'Bibliothèque Gnostique VIII: L'Évangile selon Philippe', in RevThPh 20(1970), pp. 12 - 35.
46. On the Valentinianism of the Gospel of Philip see, e.g., the introductory remarks of Schenke, Wilson and Ménard, and also the survey by K. Rudolph (ThR 34(1969), pp. 153f.). The connection with the Marcosian system arises from the presence in both it and the Gospel of Philip of the idea of marriage as an important element in salvation: see R.M. Grant, 'The Mystery of Marriage in the Gospel of Philip', in After the New Testament (Philadelphia, 1967; = ibid., in VC 15(1961), pp. 129

initially divided the work into 'Sayings' after the pattern of the Gospel of Thomas,⁽⁴⁷⁾ it is now generally agreed that the Gospel of Philip is more akin to a collection of paragraphs linked by catchwords or common themes.⁽⁴⁸⁾ The work is in any case not clearly arranged nor is a train of thought systematically developed throughout. Despite the title 'gospel' the work bears no resemblance to the canonical gospels.⁽⁴⁹⁾

The Treatise on the Resurrection (The Epistle to Rheginos) is another work from the Jung Codex,⁽⁵⁰⁾ coming

_____ (50) _____

46. (contd.) - 40), and the references there, but cf. the cautionary remarks of R. McL. Wilson, 'The Gospel of Philip', in Studies in Church History, vol. I, ed. C. W. Dugmore and C. Duggan (London, 1964), pp. 98 - 103, esp. p. 100.
47. Schenke, in TLZ 84(1959), pp. 1 - 26.
48. See the survey by K. Rudolph (ThR 34(1969), pp. 151 - 53). Schenke himself agrees that the Gospel of Philip is better described as paragraphs than as Sayings (in his review of W. C. Till, Das Evangelium nach Philippos, in TLZ 90(1965), pp. 321 - 32). On the question of the link between the various paragraphs see, e.g., Wilson, The Gospel of Philip, pp. 7 - 11, and Ménard, L'Évangile selon Philippe, pp. 2 - 6.
49. See, e.g. Puech, in NTA I, pp. 275 - 78.
50. The following editions have been used: De Resurrectione (Epistula ad Rheginum) Codex Jung F. XXII^r - F. XXV^v (pp. 43 - 50), ediderunt M. Malinine, H. C. Puech, G. Quispel, W. Till, adiuvantibus R. McL. Wilson, J. Zandee (Zürich und Stuttgart, 1963); M. L. Peel, The Epistle to Rheginos. A Valentinian Letter on the Resurrection: Introduction, Translation, Analysis and Exposition (London, 1969).

between the Gospel of Truth and the Tripartite Tractate. As the title suggests, ⁽⁵¹⁾ this short work is devoted to the problem of the resurrection, more specifically the resurrection of the believer and its foundation in the resurrection of Christ. The Valentinian origin of the work has been generally accepted, but there has been considerable hesitation in joining with the editors of the editio princeps in ascribing it to Valentinus himself. ⁽⁵²⁾

51. The title 'Epistle to Rheginos' was given to the work when the last pages of the treatise, on which the title, 'The Word ($\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$) concerning the Resurrection ($\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma$)', occurs, had not been identified. See the additional note to the article by Puech and Quispel in VC 9(1955), p. 102. On the meaning of the title and its significance for the structure of the work see Peel, op. cit., pp. 5 - 12.
52. On the Valentinianism see, e.g., Puech and Quispel, 'Les écrits gnostiques du Codex Jung', in VC 8(1954), pp. 40 - 51. Schenke does not regard the work as typically Valentinian (in a review of the editio princeps in OLZ 60(1965), pp. 471 - 77), but see the remarks of Rudolph in ThR 34(1969), pp. 206f. On the authorship of the work, Puech and Quispel (art. cit., VC 8(1954)) and the editors of the editio princeps considered that the choice lay between some unknown Valentinian of the Eastern school and Valentinus himself, and they opted for the latter. In the light of our present knowledge this is perhaps to be too precise; see, e.g., W.C. van Unnik, 'The Newly Discovered Gnostic "Epistle to Rheginos" on the Resurrection: I and II', in JEH 15(1964), pp. 141 - 67, esp. p. 144; R.MoL. Wilson, in Gnosis and the New Testament, pp. 123f.; Rudolph, art. cit., in ThR 34

This material from the Church Fathers and from the Nag Hammadi find constitutes our major source of information on Valentinian Gnosticism. To consider this mass of material raises a problem of methodology. The works show a considerable diversity of thought and expression despite their common description as Valentinian. However, to analyse each work or source individually would necessitate much repetition that would prove extremely wearying for the reader. The salvation drama itself, however, may be readily divided into a number of subsections, and under each sub-heading the 'Valentinian' understanding in all its diversity can then be examined. This method has been adopted in the next chapter.

II BACKGROUND TO THE VALENTINIAN SALVATION DRAMA

Having briefly considered the primary literary sources available for a study of Valentinianism, we are ready to begin an analysis of the salvation drama in Valentinian Gnosticism. By way of introduction to this we shall turn our attention from our documentary sources to a possible source of the salvation drama itself: the Apocryphon of John.

In Book I of the adversus haereses, having recounted at length the ideas of the Ptolemaean form of Valentinianism and the other Valentinian systems, Irenaeus gives

52. (contd.) (1969), pp. 206f.; and especially M. Peel, *op. cit.*, pp. 156 - 80.

what he understands to be the genealogy of Gnosticism from Simon Magus onwards. In the course of this genealogy, Irenaeus describes the speculation of the Barbelo-gnostics⁽⁵³⁾ and the Ophites.⁽⁵⁴⁾ At the conclusion of this description Irenaeus writes: 'Tales quidem secundum eos sententiae sunt: a quibus, velut Lernaea hydra, multiplex capitibus fera de Valentini schola generata est.'⁽⁵⁵⁾ According to Irenaeus, then, Valentinian speculations derive from the speculations of the Gnostics from Simon Magus to the Ophites, and further evidence suggests that Irenaeus had in mind the Barbelo-gnostics in particular.⁽⁵⁶⁾ In 1896 a Coptic version of the Gnostic Apocryphon of John was discovered.⁽⁵⁷⁾ The Gnostic system expounded in this work is in its first part so close to Irenaeus's account of the Barbelo-gnostics that it was thought that the document used by Irenaeus had been found.⁽⁵⁸⁾ There are however

53. adv. haer. I xxix 1 - 4; H. i 221 - 26.

54. adv. haer. I xxx 1 - 14; H. i 226 - 41.

55. adv. haer. I xxx 15; H. i 241.

56. This conclusion depends on two points: (1) that elsewhere Irenaeus speaks of Valentinus's having borrowed and adapted the principles of the gnostics (adv. haer. I xi 1; H. i 98ff.); (2) that Irenaeus appears to reserve the term 'Gnostics' for the Barbelo-gnostics (adv. haer. I xxix 1; H. i 221). See further, Sagnard, La gnose val. p. 446, n. 1.

57. For a brief account of the discovery and of the vicissitudes of the publication of the papyrus see, e.g., Puech in NTA I, pp. 314f.

58. So Carl Schmidt, 'Irenäus und seine Quelle in Adv. Haer., I, 29', in Philotesia. Paul Kleinert zum LXX. Geburtstag dargebracht (Berlin, 1907), pp. 317 - 36.

some differences,⁽⁵⁹⁾ and these, together with the discovery of no fewer than three further versions of the same work among the Nag Hammadi documents,⁽⁶⁰⁾ have made the theory of Irenaeus's direct dependence on the Apocryphon of John in any of its extant forms untenable. The startling similarities between Irenaeus's account and the Apocryphon of John cannot be ignored, but it now appears that in the newly-discovered texts we have either later versions of the work that underlies the account in Irenaeus or variant forms of the work.⁽⁶¹⁾

58. (contd.) Schmidt's conclusion is echoed by Sagnard (La gnose val., p. 439) who was in 1947 still dependent on Schmidt's article for his information.

59. The most noticeable, of course, is the fact that the account in Irenaeus represents a précis of only the first part of the Apocryphon of John. Some other differences between the relevant sections in the Apocryphon of John and the account in Irenaeus are noted below (see esp. pp. 349-50). For further differences see, e.g., H.M. Schenke, 'Nag-Hamadi Studien I: Das literarische Problem des Apokryphon Johannis', in ZRGG 14(1962), pp. 57-63, esp. pp. 57-60, and M. Krause in Foerster, Gnosis I, pp. 100-03.

60. The four versions of the work now available are, in the strict sense of the word, versions, not four copies of one version. However, the four versions fall into two groups of two representing a longer and a shorter recension. The two versions of the shorter recension show some differences; the two versions of the longer recension, one of which is in a fragmentary state, show some very minor differences mainly of orthography. In addition to the versions of the Apocryphon of John, the situation is made even more

For our present purpose we are concerned with the possibility raised in these discoveries that we now have access in the Apocryphon of John to one of the sources of the Valentinian salvation drama. This possibility was examined by F.M.M. Sagnard,⁽⁶²⁾ and he comments as follows:

If now we compare this theme with the basic scheme of Valentinus, the Apocryphon of John is assuredly more involved. It is nevertheless necessary to note well the fundamental points which they have in common: Transcendent First-Principle, which expresses itself in its own thought; successive emanations which gradually reveal It; syzygies and ordered groups of Aeons; emanation of the Christ-Light (from the Mother) with anointing by the Good Father; generations which are lights and manifestations; fall of Sophia, which is the origin of matter and evil; malformed Demiurge stemming from Sophia, who rejects him with distaste; cosmogony (and Demiurge of fire); ignorance and arrogance of the Demiurge. These documents are evidently part of a very rich current, far larger than Valentinus, and one that need not have been inspired by him. It is altogether probable that we

60. (contd.) complex by the existence among the Nag Hammadi documents of a number of works whose systems show some affinities with the system of the Apocryphon of John, e.g., The Nature of the Archons, On the Origin of the World, The Sophia of Jesus Christ and Eugnostos the Blessed.
61. See, e.g., van Unnik, Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings, pp. 71f., W. Foerster, 'Das Apokryphon des Johannes', in Gott und die Götter (Berlin, 1958), p. 141, R.McL. Wilson, Gnosis and the New Testament, pp. 104f.
62. La gnose val., pp. 439 - 46.

come in contact here with the sources of Valentinian Gnosis. (63)

This conclusion has been given cautious approval by a number of scholars. (64)

Whether or not the conclusion is accepted, a study of the salvation drama in the Apocryphon of John provides a very useful introduction to the salvation drama in Valentinian Gnosticism because of the similarity in outline though there is greater intellectual depth in the Valentinian drama. This drama is also much more Christocentric, underlining the fact that here we are considering an essential element in the tradition of the Church in its widest sense.

In the Apocryphon of John (65) the drama proper begins

63. *ibid.*, pp. 445f.

64. E.g., by Quispel, Gnosis als Weltreligion (Zürich, 1951), p. 11, Puech, in NTA I, p. 331, H. Jonas, The Gnostic Religion (2nd ed. Boston, 1963), p. 199, and the question is raised as a matter for further investigation by R. McL. Wilson, Gnosis and the New Testament, pp. 110f.

65. The following editions have been used: S. Giversen (ed.), Apocryphon Johannis. The Coptic Text of the Apocryphon Johannis in the Nag Hammadi Codex II. with Translation, Introduction and Commentary (Copenhagen, 1963); M. Krause and P. Labib (edd.), Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo (Wiesbaden, 1962; = Abhandlungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo); W.C. Till (ed.), Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502 (Berlin, 1955; = TU 60). In addition to the translations in the above editions the following translation has also been consulted: E.R. Hardy, 'The Secret Book of John', in R.M. Grant (ed.), Gnosticism:

with the Monad, above which there is nothing. He is the true God and Father of the All, the invisible Spirit, who is over the All, who exists in imperishability, who is in the pure light, the One upon whom no sight can look.

There follows a long description of this One largely in negative terms.⁽⁶⁶⁾ This One is the head of all the Aeons and the source of everything.⁽⁶⁷⁾ He perceived his image in the water that surrounds him and his Thought ($\epsilon^{\nu\nu\omicron}\alpha$) was manifested and 'stood before him in the brightness of his light'.⁽⁶⁸⁾ This is Barbelo, the image ($\epsilon^{\iota}\kappa\omega$) of the invisible virgin Spirit, the womb of the All, the eternal Aeon.⁽⁶⁹⁾ Barbelo now made a request, and the Father

65. (contd.) An Anthology, pp. 69 - 85, and the translation in Foerster, Gnosis I, pp. 105 - 20, (both are translations of the text edited by Till). The various versions are referred to as follows: ApocryJn BG = the version edited by Till; ApocryJn II, III or IV = the version in the respective codex from Nag Hammadi. Further reference is given by the page and line number of the papyrus in each case. To avoid references that are too elaborate, only one each of the longer and shorter recensions are cited, the most complete text in each case being used, i.e. BG for the shorter recension, and Codex II for the longer.
66. ApocryJn II 2.26 - 4.21; cf. BG 22.17 - 26.21. Cf. Irenaeus, adv. haer. I xxix 1; H. i 222, line 4. (The lines are counted by the Latin text in Harvey's edition).
67. ApocryJn II 4.13f., 22; cf. BG 26.9., 21f.
68. ApocryJn II 4.28f.; cf. BG 27.5 - 7; cf. Irenaeus, adv. haer. I xxix 1; H. i 222, lines 5 - 7.
69. ApocryJn II 5.9f.; cf. BG 28.1ff.; cf. Irenaeus, adv. haer. I xxix 1; H. i 222, lines 2f.

created four more Aeons: a second Thought (ἔννοια), First Knowledge (πρόγνωσις), Imperishability (ἀφθαρσία) and Eternal Life.⁽⁷⁰⁾ With Barbelo these form the pentad of the male-female decad of Aeons, which is the Father.⁽⁷¹⁾

Then Barbelo looked intensely into the pure light,⁽⁷²⁾ and became pregnant and gave birth to a blessed Spark of light; but it was not her equal in greatness.⁽⁷³⁾ This is Only-Begotten, Self-born, and the Invisible Spirit rejoiced over him and anointed him with his goodness until he became perfect, lacking nothing in goodness.⁽⁷⁴⁾ Like Barbelo, Only-Begotten made a request to the Father, and there appeared in order Mind (νοῦς), Will and Word (λόγος).

70. ApocryJn II 5.11 - 6.2; cf. BG 28.4 - 29.8; cf. adv. haer. I xxix 1; H. i 222, lines 6 - 8.

71. ApocryJn II 6.2 - 10; cf. BG 29.8 - 17. There is confusion between the short and long recension over the members of the feminine pentad. If one accepts the conclusions of Till in his notes to the edition of the Berlin Codex (op. cit., pp. 297 - 99) that there are in fact two Thoughts (ἔννοια), the discrepancies are fairly readily explained, but clearly the confusion antedates both recensions. The further problem of the relationship of the two recensions to each other and to the account in Irenaeus cannot be pursued here. See e.g. the notes of Giversen, op. cit., ad loc.

72. ApocryJn BG 29.18f. cf. II 6.10f.: 'He (sc. the Father) looked intensely at Barbelo.'

73. ApocryJn II 6.10 - 15; cf. BG 29.18 - 30.9; cf. adv. haer. I xxix 1; H. i 222, lines 8 - 10.

74. ApocryJn II 6.15 - 28; cf. BG 30.4 - 31.1; cf. adv. haer. I xxix 1; H. i 222, lines 11 - 13 where this anointed spark of light is Christ, and Autogenes is a separate, later emanation.

Through the Word, Self-born, Christ, created everything.⁽⁷⁵⁾
 The Aeons are arranged in pairs.⁽⁷⁶⁾ Self-born was

75. ApocryJn II 6.33 - 7.11; cf. BG 31.5 - 18; cf. adv. haer. I xxix 1; H. i 222, lines 13 - 15. Presumably these emanations represent the masculine pentad the counterpart of the feminine one, but who constitute the five members of the masculine pentad? Four of them are Autogenes, Mind, Will and Word. Who is the fifth? Is it the Father? Or is Goodness a separate emanation? If we accept the latter, then we must bear in mind that the Coptic abbreviation for 'goodness', ΜΝΤΧΡ may also represent 'anointedness', i.e., 'Christness', which would lead to the possibility that the fifth member of the pentad is not 'Goodness' but Christ. This would tie in well with the fact that in Irenaeus's account Autogenes and Christ are quite distinct. Yet, in the Apocryphon of John the two are clearly equated (see below, pp. 349f.). Is it then possible that the masculine pentad has suffered the same fate as the feminine one and that just as there should perhaps be two Thoughts, a first Thought (= Barbelo) and a second Thought, so there should be two Christs, a first Christ (= Autogenes) and a second Christ (or Goodness?). The problem cannot be pursued any further here.
76. Although the account in Irenaeus says that the Aeons were arranged in pairs (adv. haer. I xxix 2; H. i 222 line 16 - 223 line 1), this is never explicitly stated in the Apocryphon of John with the exception of Sophia, whose consort (σὺς υἱός) enters abruptly later in the drama (ApocryJn II 9.32f.; BG 37.4f.). With regard to pairs in the world of light, Schenke rightly observes ('Nag-Hamadi Studien I', ZRGG 14(1962) p. 58 and 'Nag-Hamadi Studien III', ZRGG 14(1962), p. 358) that the Father and Barbelo also form a pair. Despite Schenke's contention that the remaining Aeons are not arranged in pairs there are some signs that

appointed as God over the All by the Invisible Spirit.⁽⁷⁷⁾

From Christ and Imperishability came the four great lights, and each light has its three attendant Aeons. The names of the Lights are Harmozel, Oroiael, Daveithe and Eleleth. All these Aeons belong to Self-born. The third attendant Aeon of the last light, i.e. the last of the Aeons, is Sophia.⁽⁷⁸⁾ Then from First Knowledge and perfect Mind came the perfect man, Adam, who is set in the first light. His son, Seth, is set in the second light, the children of Seth are set in the third light and in the fourth light are those who recognized their

76. (contd.) other Aeons were in fact in pairs. Thus there is reference to the fact that 'Eternal Life together with his Will and Mind together with First Knowledge' (ApocryJn II 7.11 - 13; cf. BG 31.19 - 21); then there is 'from Christ and Imperishability' (II 7.30 - 32; BG 32.20f.) and 'from First Knowledge and perfect Mind' (II 8.28f.; BG 34.19f.). All these pairs coincide with the pairs listed by Irenaeus. However, the presence of these pairs in the Apocryphon of John produces some contradictions (see Schenke, 'Nag-Hamadi Studien III', ZRGG 14(1962), pp. 358 - 60), and Schenke concludes, perhaps rightly, that the arrangement in pairs is secondary. However, as he admits, the references to the pairs must have been in the original Greek text, and, what Schenke does not point out, the arrangement in pairs must have been part of the tradition of the Apocryphon of John at the time when a version of the work was used by Irenaeus.
77. ApocryJn II 7.22 - 24; cf. BG 32.12 - 15; cf. adv. haer. I xxix 2; H. i 223, line 4.
78. ApocryJn II 7.30 - 8.28; cf. BG 32.20 - 34.18; cf. adv. haer. I xxix 2; H. i 223, lines 5 - 15.

perfection but did not immediately repent. (79)

That ends the description of the formation of the world of light and we come now to the Fall. Sophia, the last of the Aeons devised a thought on her own without the consent of the invisible Spirit or her consort, and the desire that this engendered in her caused her to produce an imperfect work, a son Ialdabaoth, who was expelled from the place of the Aeons, but took with him some of his Mother's power. (80) There follows a description of Ialdabaoth's Powers, Angels and Aeons, which are modelled on the eternal Aeons, and of their control over the seven heavens, the world and Hades. Looking at all this Ialdabaoth said: 'I am a jealous God; there is no other God beside me', but his very jealousy proves the existence of another God of whom he is jealous. (81)

Sophia then recognised her deficiency and 'went to and fro' (82) in the darkness of ignorance and repented.

79. ApocryJn 8.28 - 9.24; cf. BG 34.19 - 36.16; cf. adv. haer. I xxix 3; H. i 223, line 15 - 224, line 2, thereafter there are some substantial differences, and even so Adamas is from Autogenes in Irenaeus's account.

80. ApocryJn II 9.25 - 10.23; cf. BG 36.16 - 38.19; cf. adv. haer. I xxix 4; H. i 225, line 1 - 226, line 11 where the trouble arises precisely because Sophia has no consort.

81. ApocryJn II 10.23 - 13.13; cf. BG 39.1 - 44.19; cf. adv. haer. I xxix 4; H. i 226, lines 7 - 14, 16 - 18.

82. ἐπιφύρεσθαι. Cf. Gen. 1.2 LXX.

The whole Pleroma entreated for her and the Holy Invisible Spirit took pity on her and 'poured over her a spirit from the fullness (πλήρωμα)' and her consort descended to her to correct her deficiency and, while unable to return at once to her place, she was brought to the place of the ninth to remain there until her deficiency had been made up. (83)

The Father now showed to Ialdabaoth and his archons 'the image of the invisible, the Father of the All', and Ialdabaoth said to his Powers: 'Come, let us make a man after the image (εἰκῶν) of God and after our likeness so that his image (εἰκῶν) may become our light.' They all contributed to making Adam but could not make him stand up. (84)

83. ApocryJn II 13.13 - 14.13; cf. BG 44.19 - 47.14; cf. adv. haer. I xxix 4; H. i 226, lines 15f. where Sophia withdraws to a place above the eighth (= in the ninth?). Carl Schmidt regarded this passing reference to Sophia's feelings of shame as the decisive proof that Irenaeus has made a précis of only part of the work to which he had access, since in the Apocryphon of John Sophia's repentance comes after Ialdabaoth's declaration that he alone is God (Schmidt, art. cit., pp. 333f.). Schenke, however, has shown that Sophia feels guilty for reasons in the Apocryphon of John that are quite different from those in Irenaeus's account, and that in Irenaeus's account the repentance of Sophia takes its logical place in its own scheme and is therefore not a précis of a later stage in the drama (Schenke, 'Nag-Hamadi Studien I', ZRGG 14(1962), pp. 59f.).

84. ApocryJn II 15.2 - 19.15; cf. BG 48.11 - 51.1, which omits a long section enumerating the angels who

The redemptive plan now is explained. 'The Mother wished to recover the power which she had given to the first Archon.'⁽⁸⁵⁾ She besought the Father and he sent Self-born and the four lights⁽⁸⁶⁾ to the first Archon and they, in order to recover the power of the Mother, advised the Archon to breathe some of the spirit he had into the face of the inert man. The Archon did so and the man arose, but, unwittingly, the Archon transferred to the man some of the Mother's power. The man in fact now surpassed his creators and the Apocryphon continues in a description of a series of moves on both sides as the Mother and the Archon struggle to release or trap the spirit or power now in the man.⁽⁸⁷⁾

First the Protarchon, Ialdabaoth, immersed Adam in matter (ἐλγ), but the eternal Father sent an Epinoia of Light to help Adam. This Epinoia of Light will lead man to his fullness (πληρῶμα) and is hidden in Adam so that the Archons may not know of its existence.⁽⁸⁸⁾ However, the Epinoia cast a shadow, so the Archons constructed a corporeal world of earth, air, fire and water. Again the Epinoia of Light awakened man's thought.⁽⁸⁹⁾ The Archons then set man in Paradise and commanded him to eat of the tree of life, which, from the point of view of the world

84. (contd.) assist in making the man.

85. ApocryJn II 19.15 - 17; cf. BG 51.2 - 4.

86. ApocryJn BG 51.9f.; cf. II 19.18f. 'the five lights'; cf. III 24.1 - 3: 'He sent them . . . with his four lights.'

87. ApocryJn II 19.21 - 20.5; cf. BG 51.13 - 52.11.

88. ApocryJn II 20.9 - 26; cf. BG 52.15 - 53.20.

of light, is the tree of death.⁽⁹⁰⁾ The Saviour tells John⁽⁹¹⁾ that He persuaded them (plural though Eve had not yet been created!) to eat from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil which is the Epinoia of light.⁽⁹²⁾ The serpent then taught them (plural again) sexual desire, a further device of Ialdabaoth.

The Archon now wanted to retrieve the power given to Adam, and he brought on Adam an unconsciousness - not sleep - and intended to bring the Epinoia of Light out through Adam's side.⁽⁹³⁾ Being unconscious Adam no longer knows instinctively his true nature and he must be awakened. The Archon succeeded in bringing out only part of the power, and fashioned this into a woman in accordance with the image of the Epinoia. However, the Epinoia in Eve awakened Adam to recognize his own form and through the Epinoia Adam and Eve 'tasted the perfect knowledge'.⁽⁹⁴⁾ So the Epinoia saved Adam and Eve. The Archon then cast them out of Paradise and, raping Eve, from whom the Epinoia escaped, begot Eloim and Jahve, whom he set over the fire, wind, water and earth. Adam, however, knew the image of his

89. ApocryJn II 20.28 - 21.16; cf. BG 54.5 - 55.17.

90. ApocryJn II 21.16 - 22.2; cf. BG 55.18 - 57.8.

91. At this point the frame story within which the drama is set intrudes into the drama itself. In the frame story the Saviour delivers the revelation to John.

92. ApocryJn II 22.3 - 9; cf. BG 57.8 - 58.1.

93. ApocryJn II 22.18 - 30; cf. BG 58.10 - 59.9.

94. ApocryJn II 22.31 - 23.35; cf. BG 59.9 - 61.7. There is some difference between the two recensions here.

See below, p. 348.

First Knowledge and brought forth the image of the son of man and called him Seth. The Mother sent down her spirit on Seth, but the Archon gave him water of unconsciousness to drink so that he might not know whence he came. 'And the seed was in this state a long time, working so that when the Spirit should descend through the holy Aeons, it might raise it up and heal it of its deficiency so that the whole fullness (πλήρωμα) might be holy and without deficiency.' (95)

In the Apocryphon of John there follows a section devoted to various questions on the soul, and from the answers given it is understood that there are two spirits struggling for the possession of the soul: the Spirit that the Mother sends down seeks to give life to the soul and cause it to rise upward to the great light, and the imitation spirit that seeks to draw the soul into wickedness and keep it under the power of the Archon. In the same section is described the ultimate destinies of men and the end of the drama. Those on whom the Spirit of Life descends will rise upward to the great light and attain the Rest (ἀνάπαυσις) of the Aeons; those in the grip of the imitation spirit will return into another body until they are saved from lack of perception and attain knowledge; those who turn away from the truth and blaspheme against the Holy Spirit are doomed to eternal punishment. (96) The drama is referred to once again when

95. ApocryphJn II 25.9 - 16; cf. BG 64.3 - 13.

96. ApocryphJn II 25.23 - 26.7; 26.28 - 32; 26.36 - 27.11; 27.24 - 31; cf. BG 65.3 - 66.12; 68.8 - 13; 68.17 -

John asks about the origin of the imitation spirit. First there is a brief résumé of the work of the Epinoia who had awakened the seed of the perfect race.⁽⁹⁷⁾ The various responses of the Archon to this are then given. They are: Fate (the determinism of times and seasons), the flood - though the Light of the Pronoia rescued Noah - , the intercourse of angels with women, and finally the imitation spirit implanted in the women, which leads to materialism. The situation still exists up to the present.⁽⁹⁸⁾

It would be totally misleading to describe this as a Christo-centric salvation drama. Even as a drama there are a number of inconsistencies that distort the clear line of action and development and perhaps point to the composite nature of the work.⁽⁹⁹⁾ So far as the drama itself is concerned we may note e.g. that nothing is said in the account of the emanation of the Aeons about the existence of Sophia's consort, and yet Sophia is said to have acted without her consort's consent, and the consort has a role, albeit a minor one, in the scheme of redemption. Then the arrangement of the Aeons in syzygies is far from clear and the members of the decad of the Father's Aeons, the masculine and feminine pentads are not always readily

96. (contd.) 69.13; 70.12 - 71.2.

97. ApocryJn II 27.33 - 28.5; cf. BG 71.6 - 14.

98. ApocryJn II 28.5 - 30.11; cf. BG 71.14 - 75.10.

99. That the work is composite is universally agreed, but see especially Schenke, 'Nag-Hamadi Studien I', in ZRGG 14(1962), esp. pp. 60 - 63. Cf. also Doresse, The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics, pp. 210f. and Wilson, Gnosis and the New Testament, pp. 105ff.

identifiable.⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ There is no clear link made between Adam, Seth, Seth's descendants, and those who repent only at the end, who are placed in the four lights, and the Adam fashioned by Ialdabaoth in the image of the Father of all.⁽¹⁰¹⁾ There is confusion in the episodes of the struggle to possess man; features that clearly apply to both Adam and Eve are addressed to Adam when he has no partner at all. With regard to the redemption there is the theme of the Epinoia of Light that comes from the Father to wake man, the theme of the spirit sent by the mother, and then in the present form of the work a redemptive role is also given to Christ. The confusions could be multiplied,⁽¹⁰²⁾ but enough has been said to show that we have to deal with a work that is at times both confused and confusing.

100. See above notes 71 and 75.

101. Foerster (art. cit., in Gott und die Götter, p. 135) regards the placing of Adam and Seth etc. as proleptic. Schenke, however ('Nag-Hamadi Studien I', ZRGG 14(1962), p. 61), regards the confusion at this point as evidence that the work falls into two distinct parts.

102. See further esp. Foerster, art. cit., in Gott und die Götter, pp. 140f. and Schenke, 'Nag-Hamadi Studien I and III', in ZRGG 14(1962), pp. 57 - 63, 352 - 61.

Some of the confusion at least in the section on the struggles of Ialdabaoth and the mother to possess man, arise from the fact that the drama is not a single progressive story but a series of stories all telling the same thing. See, e.g. L. Schottroff, Der Glaubende und die feindliche Welt. Beobachtungen zum gnostischen Dualismus und seiner Bedeutung für Paulus und das Johannesevangelium (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1970; = Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 37), p. 10.

It is not even entirely accurate to describe the drama in the Apocryphon of John as a salvation drama, for the emphasis is not on salvation at all. Principally the drama here recorded is an explanation of man's situation, his predicament that he feels drawn in two different directions, with particular reference to how this state of affairs came about.⁽¹⁰³⁾ Nevertheless, with the description of the destinies of men, especially of the race that does not waver - the divine seed that will return whence it came so that the whole pleroma might be holy and without deficiency - there are all the makings of a complete drama that recounts not only the descent of the spiritual seed into this vale of woe and its entanglement in matter but also the work of rescue and the ascent of the seed back to the world of light.

103. The comment of Charles Bigg on Gnosticism as a whole is apposite here: 'It was an attempt, a serious attempt, to fathom the dread mystery of sorrow and pain, to answer that spectral doubt, which is mostly crushed down by force - Can the world as we know it have been made by God?' (The Christian Platonists of Alexandria, 2nd ed., Oxford, 1913; = The Bampton Lectures for 1886, pp. 54f.) Cf. also van Unnik's comment on the Apocryphon of John itself: 'The aim of the treatise . . . is to furnish knowledge concerning the visible and invisible and instruction about the perfecting of Mankind. . . . The anthropological question of the nature and destiny of the human being is therefore central' (Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings, p. 72), and Schottroff, op. cit., p. 68.

The actual events of redemption receive relatively little emphasis. The Mother, Sophia, wishes to recover the power she lost, and to achieve this the Father of the All sends Autogenes and the four lights to persuade Ialdabaoth to breathe some of the spirit he had received from his Mother into the man he had created,⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ and at various stages of the ensuing struggle for the possession of man there appears the Epinoia of Light which rescues man.⁽¹⁰⁵⁾ Sophia also sends down her spirit on Seth⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ and this spirit strives against the counterfeit Spirit of the First Archon, Ialdabaoth, but the Epinoia and the spirit from the Mother are scarcely redeemer-figures,⁽¹⁰⁷⁾ and

104. S. Arai argues, perhaps rightly, that originally there was no reference here to Autogenes (S. Arai, 'Zur Christologie des Apokryphons des Johannes', in NTS 15(1969), pp. 302 - 18, see pp. 305 - 07).

105. In the present form of the Apocryphon of John there is only a tenuous connection between the Epinoia and the world of light, it is sent by the Father from the world of light; but since the work has undergone a complex path of development it is possible that the Epinoia is one of the Aeons in another guise. Foerster, for example, wonders if the Epinoia may not be Barbelo (art. cit., in Gott und die Götter, p. 140), see also Schottroff, op. cit., p. 66.

106. The suggestion made in the previous note may also apply here. Is then the spirit from Sophia the Epinoia? See Foerster, art. cit., in Gott und die Götter, p. 138.

107. Indeed, according to Schottroff (op. cit., pp. 10f.) the term redemption is not really accurate. The struggle is for possession of that which gives man the possibility of redemption, i.e. his soul, which is capable of following either the true spirit or the

Self-born's role is simply one of telling the Archon what to do, and that itself, while beginning the process of rescue, does not really constitute redemption.

There is, however, another passage in the longer recension of the Apocryphon of John that we have not yet considered; a passage in which much greater emphasis is laid on redemption.⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ In this section we have a first-person account by 'the perfect Pronoia of the All', 'the richness of the light', 'the thought of the Fullness ($\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega\mu\alpha$)', who descended three times into the darkness, into the midst of the prison, into the inside of Hades ($\epsilon\mu\nu\tau\epsilon$), and the foundations of chaos were shaken. On the first two occasions the perfect Pronoia withdrew 'lest they should destroy themselves before the proper time.' On the third occasion the perfect Pronoia goes into the midst of the prison 'that is the prison of the body' and calls whoever will listen to awake from sleep. Having roused the man, the perfect Pronoia seals him ($\sigma\phi\rho\alpha\gamma\iota\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$) in the light of death with five seals so that death might have no power over him from that time on.

Certainly the idea of redemption receives much greater emphasis here, but this does not make the drama of the Apocryphon of John into a salvation drama. In the first place there is the problem of the relationship of this section to the rest of the work.⁽¹⁰⁹⁾ It is absent from

107. (contd) imitation spirit. On Sophia as a redeemer figure in the Apocryphon of John see Schottroff (ibid., pp. 59 - 66).

108. ApocryJn II 30.12 - 31.25.

the versions of the work contained in the Berlin Codex and in Codex III of Nag Hammadi. The precise relationship between the shorter and longer recensions of the work is very difficult to determine, and cannot be pursued here.⁽¹¹⁰⁾

In any case, the redemptive revelation described in this section is not decisively linked with the preceding drama. It may perhaps be understood as a more explicit statement about the descent of the Epinoia of Light or the Spirit from the Mother, but this association is not directly made in the text.⁽¹¹¹⁾ Furthermore, it is by no means clear whether this redemptive revelation is a once-for-all event in a single drama, or the event that takes place whenever

109. Most scholars consider that the passage is a secondary interpolation or development, e.g. MacRae ('Sleep and Awakening in Gnostic Texts', in Origini, pp. 496 - 507), Doresse (op. cit., p. 211), Jonas (The Gnostic Religion, p. 306), L. Schottroff ('Heil als innerweltliche Entweltlichung', in NT 11(1969), pp. 294 - 317, see pp. 305f.). Puech is undecided (NTA I, p. 327), Giversen sees it as part of the whole work (op. cit., pp. 270 - 73).

110. See esp. S. Giversen, op. cit., p. 277, who argues that the shorter version is an abridgement of the longer, though at times the shorter is the more reliable, and the longer contains some insertions. Cf. R. Kasser, 'Le "Livre secret de Jean" dans ses différentes formes textuelles coptes', in Le Muséon 77(1964), pp. 5 - 16, who argues that the longer version is a development of the shorter. See also Puech, in NTA I, pp. 329ff. and Wilson, Gnosis and the New Testament, pp. 109f.

111. George MacRae associates the three descents of the perfect Pronoia with the awakening of Adam and Eve in Eden, the awakening of the seed of the perfect race after the flood and the coming of Christ respectively

a man comes to the knowledge of his true nature and destiny. Is it the drama of salvation or the drama of each man's salvation? Another point about the section is that there are faint echoes that associate the revealer, i.e. the perfect Pronoia, with Christ. There is no direct reference to Christ in the passage at all,⁽¹¹²⁾ but, in the context, the first-person singular of the episode continues without interruption into the first-person singular of the frame story in which Christ addresses John. From the context, then, one is entitled to ask whether the juxtaposition of the two sections in the first-person singular was accidental or deliberate. In the latter case the association of the perfect Pronoia with Christ may have been intended.⁽¹¹³⁾ The descent of the perfect Pronoia to Hades for the redemption of man also recalls Christ's descensus ad inferos, which, on occasion, is specifically for the redemption of Adam.⁽¹¹⁴⁾ However, here Hades is identified with the body,⁽¹¹⁵⁾ and the call to awaken is directed to

111. (contd.) (art. cit., pp. 498 - 502).

112. As Giversen notes, 'it is conspicuous that the redeemer is nowhere referred to as Christ, nor as Jesus or Saviour or Lord' (op. cit., p. 270). Schottroff (art. cit., p. 304) even regards it as 'in keiner Weise von christlicher Tradition beeinflusst'. Cf. id., op. cit., pp. 99 - 114.

113. S. Arai (art. cit., pp. 307 - 14) not only identifies the perfect Pronoia as Christ but regards the whole section ApocryJn II 30.11 - 31.25 as a Christian interpretation of BG 75.10 - 13 and as a secondary development.

114. See ch. 3 nn.63, 116; ch. 4 n.140; ch. 5 n.191.

115. ApocryJn II 31.4.

'Whoever hears ($\pi\epsilon\tau\epsilon\omega\tau\eta\mu$)' and not to Adam; that is, the call is more universal.

The references in the last paragraph to the role of Christ raise the broader question of the role of Christ in the drama as a whole. So far as the work of redemption is concerned we may be brief. We have just considered the section that occurs only in the longer recension. The role of Christ there, if indeed the perfect Pronoia may be identified with Christ, is that of one who brings the saving knowledge to the sleeping man, and the real importance lies in the message and not in the messenger. Aside from this passage it is the Father who takes steps to rescue Sophia by pouring a spirit of perfection over her and sending her consort to her.⁽¹¹⁶⁾ In order to cause the first Archon, Ialdabaoth, to give up some of the power he took from Sophia, Self-born and the four lights are sent to him to tell him to breathe in the face of the inert man, but this action is scarcely redemption. As we have noted the Epinoia of Light and the spirit from Sophia are hardly redeemer figures. That leaves only one further redemptive act that possibly shows Christ as a redeemer. In the shorter recension it is said that 'the Epinoia taught him (sc. Adam) knowledge through the tree in the form of an eagle,'⁽¹¹⁷⁾ but in the longer recension Christ tells John, 'I revealed myself, I, in the form of an eagle on the tree

116. ApocryJn II 14.5ff.; cf. BG 47.2ff. See Schottroff, op. cit., pp. 57 - 59.

117. ApocryJn BG 60.19 - 61.2.

of knowledge - which is the Epinoia from the Pronoia of the pure light - in order that I might teach them (so. Adam and Eve) and awaken them from the depth of sleep.'⁽¹¹⁸⁾ The Epinoia is here identified with the tree and the eagle with Christ. In all probability the reference to Christ represents an intrusion into the drama of the 'Christian' frame story in which Christ gives the revelation to John.⁽¹¹⁹⁾ Van Unnik's comment on the work as a whole is therefore equally justified when applied to the drama itself: 'The role of Jesus Christ is clearly no more than that of mediator of the true Knowledge, which is the real saving power. Jesus has no central place in the work of redemption. The figure of Jesus could come right out of the book without changing its character in any essential respect.'⁽¹²⁰⁾ Indeed, with regard to the redemption in the drama itself, perhaps this is even to overstate the role of Jesus.

Scarcely any greater role is given to Christ in the events in the world of light. At several points in the text it is suggested that Self-born is also named Christ.⁽¹²¹⁾ Some of these references are by no means clear owing to the ambiguity of the Coptic abbreviation **XC**, which may

118. ApoeryJn II 23.26 - 31.

119. See Arai, art. cit., pp. 317f.

120. Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings, pp. 76f.; cf. Arai, art. cit.

121. ApoeryJn II 6.23 - 26; 7.1f.; 7.11; 7.19f.; 7.31 - 33; 8.23; 9.1f.; cf. BG 30.14 - 18; 31.7ff.; 31.16 - 19; 32.8f.; 32.20 - 33.3; 34.11f.; 35.7f.

represent both *χριστός* (anointed, Christ) and *χρηστός* (good).⁽¹²²⁾ In any case, Christ has a very minor part to play in the drama. In the account of Irenaeus, the anointed offspring of the Father and Barbelo is clearly called Christ,⁽¹²³⁾ but there is no identification of Christ with Self-born. Self-born is a separate emanation from Thought and Word; he is the representative of Christ, his consort is Truth and he rules over all.⁽¹²⁴⁾ The essential difference between the Apocryphon of John and Irenaeus at this point is in the relationship of Christ to Self-born. In Irenaeus Christ has a role that is more closely integrated into the whole system, but it is still not a highly significant role. In the Apocryphon of John the removal of the references to Christ would cause no damage to the drama whatsoever.

A further comment must be made, however, on the role of Self-born, for it is possible that it was his role that attracted his identification as Christ by some Christian Gnostics, for at least in its present form the Apocryphon of John has been given a superficial

122. ApocryJn II 6.25 (long recension) reads: *ΕΝΥΨΑΔΑΤ Ν[Χ]ΑΔΥ ΔΑΝ' ΜΜΝΤ[Χ]Ρ[Ε]*; BG 30.16f. (short recension) reads: *ΕΜΝ ΨΤΑ ΝΖΗΤΥ ΝΧΤ* (III 10.2 *ΝΧΡΕ*). The problem of whether this is 'Christ' or 'Goodness' is complicated by the difficulty of identifying the five members of the masculine pentad (see above, n. 75). At ApocryJn II 7.1f.; BG 31.7ff. Krause and Labib offer 'Good' as an alternative to 'Christ'.
123. adv. haer. I xxix 1; H. i 222, line 13.
124. adv. haer. I xxix 2; H. i 223, lines 2 - 4. Cf. ApocryJn II 7.26 etc.

Christian setting. Self-born has an important role in the Apocryphon of John in the emanation and establishment of the world of light. Through the Word Self-born created the All; He is set as head over the All; out of him⁽¹²⁵⁾ come the four lights, and they and their twelve Aeons belong to him; through his will Mind and Foreknowledge produced the heavenly Adam who is set in the first Aeon with Self-born. Whether or not the role here given to Self-born was his originally or both his and Christ's or only Christ's, there is a general similarity to the role of Christ in creation and as Lord of all in the 'orthodox' tradition of the Church. If the role in the Apocryphon of John was not originally Christ's it is such that a Christian Gnostic might find it appropriate to associate Christ with it. There is one further reference to Self-born in the short recension in the plan to persuade Ialdabaoth to breathe some of the spirit into the inert man,⁽¹²⁶⁾ but, as we have noted, this is scarcely an act of redemption.

125. There is confusion in the text here; it reads: 'for from the light, which is Christ, and Imperishability by the will of God the Spirit (came) the four lights from the divine Autogenes' (ApocryJn II 7.30 - 33). See further, Schenke, 'Nag-Hamadi Studien III', ZRGG 14(1962), p. 359.

126. ApocryJn BG 51.8 - 10.

From all this it is obvious that not only is the drama in the Apocryphon of John rather confused and disjointed at some points, but it does not merit the description salvation drama in the full sense of the term, and furthermore it can in no way be regarded as Christocentric. It would also appear that the form of the Apocryphon of John to which Irenaeus had access was somewhat more Christocentric than our extant versions of the work, though even then the position of Christ relates solely to the coming into existence of the world of light and has nothing to do with redemption.⁽¹²⁷⁾ If indeed the system of the Apocryphon of John lies behind Valentinian Gnosticism, then it must undergo considerable development and modification before it can be described as a Christocentric salvation drama. To Valentinian Gnosticism we shall now turn.

127. It should be noted, of course, that the form of the Apocryphon of John known to Irenaeus contained only the first part of the work as we now know it. See Schenke, 'Nag-Hamadi Studien I', in ZRGG 14(1962), esp. pp. 57 - 60.

THE CHRISTOCENTRIC SALVATION HISTORY

OF IRENAEUS

AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO

THE ECCLESIASTICAL TRADITION

AND VALENTINIAN GNOSTICISM

VOLUME II

K.N. BOOTH



Th 8198

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE VALENTINIAN SALVATION DRAMA

In the following analysis of the Christocentric salvation drama in Valentinian Gnosticism our attention is focused on those elements in the drama that shed light on its Christocentric and salvation character. The drama purely as a drama is not our immediate concern. In fact, in all the material at our disposal the complete drama, presented as a coherent succession of events, is available at present in only one source, the account of the Ptolemaean system as preserved by Irenaeus, with some additional details from the parallel source in the Excerpta ex Theodoto.⁽¹⁾ While many details of the scheme will of necessity have to be discussed, familiarity with the structure of the system is assumed. We shall, however, follow the general outline of the system as it is presented in Irenaeus's account of Ptolemaeus, and shall consider the matter under the following heads: Christ in the Pleroma; The Demiurge and the Lower World; The Descent of the Saviour; Redemption; The Consummation.

I CHRIST IN THE PLEROMA

The whole salvation drama begins with the primal Father's will to reveal himself and in this very fact are

1. See above, pp.304ff. Eventually the complete edition of the Tractatus Tripartitus will provide us with another complete account of the drama.

laid the seeds of the drama, for we are concerned here with the revelation of one who is essentially unknowable, ineffable and incomprehensible.⁽²⁾ So in Irenaeus's account of Marcus Magus we read: 'When at first the Father, to whom no-one is Father . . . wished the ineffable to become effable and the invisible to take form, he opened his mouth and brought forth Logos, similar to himself, which, standing alongside, showed him what he was, he appearing as form of the invisible.'⁽³⁾ The revelation of the invisible takes place by the Father emanating from himself one who is able to make him known: 'Therefore the Father, being unknown, wished to become known to the Aeons, and through his own Desire (*ἐκθυμῆσις*) (since he knows himself) he emanated Only-Begotten, spirit of knowledge existing in knowledge.'⁽⁴⁾ The Tractatus Tripartitus likewise, which devotes a quite lengthy section to the Father's ineffability,⁽⁵⁾ maintains that the Father, out of his love and abundant greatness wished to be known,⁽⁶⁾ and

2. This is, of course, a commonplace not only in Gnosticism but in the whole of the early Christian tradition. Cf. ApocryJn II 2.26 - 4.22; For the most extreme form of this in the extant Gnostic literature cf. Hippolytus's account of the system of Basilides (Ref. VII 20.2 - 22.1). See also G.L. Prestige, God in Patristic Thought, pp. 1 - 14, and ch. 2 passim.
3. adv. haer. I xiv 1; H. i 129.
4. Exc. ex Theod. 7.1; cf. 7.3.
5. Tract. Trip. 51.1ff., esp. 54.2 - 55.14.
6. Trac. Trip. 57.26 - 29; cf. 56.9 - 15, and Heracleon, Fragment 31.

brought into being the Son who is 'the form of the formless, the body of the bodiless, the face of the invisible, the word of the ineffable, the mind of the inconceivable . . .'.⁽⁷⁾

There is, then an extremely close relationship between revelation and emanation.⁽⁸⁾ This same close connection between the emanation of the Son or Only-Begotten and the Father's will to reveal himself can be clearly seen in the Gospel of Truth: 'Since the Father is unbegotten, it is he alone who had brought forth a name for him (sc. the Son) before he produced the Aeons, so that the name of the Father might be over them as Lord, he who is the authentic name which is steadfast in its authority, perfect in its power' (38.32 - 39.3). The Son is both the revelation of the Father for the redemption of the Aeons and was begotten before them as their head.⁽⁹⁾ The Son is the foundation of the Father's revelation: 'While they (sc. the Father's words of revelation) were the depth of his thought, the Logos who was first to come forth, revealed them and also a mind which speaks the single word in a silent grace,⁽¹⁰⁾ and it (m.) was called "thought" because they were in it (f.) before they were revealed.'⁽¹¹⁾ While the pronouns

7. Trac. Trip. 66.13 - 16; cf. the whole section 64.28 - 66.29.

8. Cf. Trac. Trip. 70.29ff.

9. See Grobel, op. cit., n. 570.

10. Cf. the translation of Till: ' . . . hat der λόγος . . . sie und einen sprechenden νοῦς geoffenbart. Der einzige λόγος ist in schweigender Gnade (χαράς).'.

11. Ev. Ver. 37.7 - 14; cf. 37.15 - 21, though Grobel considers that this latter may refer to the Incarnation (op. cit., n. 533).

make the precise relationship confused,⁽¹²⁾ the importance of the Son (here, the Logos) for the projection of the Father's revelation is perfectly clear; He was the first to come forth.⁽¹³⁾

The accounts so far mentioned all have systems that begin with a monad, but even in those systems that begin with a dyad a similar intention can be observed. This can be seen most fully in the system of Ptolemaeus. There the drama begins with the invisible, inexpressible, perfect Aeon, Pre-Beginning, Forefather, or Depth, with whom is Thought ($\xi\nu\nu\omicron\iota\alpha$), also called Grace and Silence. 'This Depth conceived the idea of bringing forth from himself a Beginning ($\alpha\rho\chi\eta$) of all things, and this emanation, which he wished to bring forth, he placed like a seed within the womb of Silence who was with him. Silence, having received this seed and become pregnant, brought forth Mind ($\nu\omicron\upsilon\hat{\omicron}\varsigma$), like and equal to the one who brought forth, and alone receiving the greatness of the Father. Mind is also called Only-Begotten ($\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\varsigma$) and Father and Beginning of all.'⁽¹⁴⁾ Only-Begotten, realising why he had been brought forth, emanated Logos and Life who in turn emanated Man and Church. This makes up the first ogdoad, which is arranged in syzygies. Logos and Life

12. See e.g. Till, in Orientalia 27(1958), p. 278, and Grobel, op. cit., nn. 528 - 31.

13. Cf. below, note 17.

14. adv. haer. I i 1; H. i 8f. Cf. the role of Only-Begotten in the Apocryphon of John, who despite the fact that he is emanated only after the complete

then emanate ten further Aeons and Man and Church twelve, making thirty Aeons in all, the last of whom is Sophia. Of all these Aeons, the only one who knows the Forefather is Only-Begotten, 'to the remainder, the Forefather is invisible and incomprehensible,'⁽¹⁵⁾ and Only-Begotten thought to convey to them that the Father is without beginning and incomprehensible. 'Silence, however, restrained him by the will of the Father, because she wished to lead them all to knowledge and desire of seeking their Forefather.'⁽¹⁶⁾ While in this system the Forefather

14. (contd.) female pentad holds a dominant position in the system.

15. adv. haer. I ii 1; H. i 13.

16. ibid. Cf. another account in Theodotus: 'Silence, they say, being the Mother of all those emanated by Depth has maintained silence about the Ineffable in respect of what she cannot say, but has declared incomprehensible what she has comprehended' (Exc. ex Theod. 29). Casey emends to read: 'What she has not comprehended'. The emendation is rejected by Sagnard (ad loc.) and also by Festugière in his article, 'Notes sur les Extraits de Théodote de Clément d'Alexandrie et sur les fragments de Valentin', in VC 3(1949), pp. 193 - 207, see esp. pp. 196 - 98. Festugière, however, wishes to translate as follows: 'Silence . . . for as much as (pour autant que) she was unable to express the Ineffable, kept silence; for as much as she comprehended, she named it Incomprehensible.' I.e. he reads the initial ó (pour autant que) adverbially.

is not as directly involved in his self-revelation, the same basic elements are present: the unknowable Father; the emanation of one who will make him known. Indeed, in all the systems a position of fundamental importance is held by this one who is emanated either directly by the Father or by the primal Father and his consort; this one is called variously, ⁽¹⁷⁾ Only-Begotten (Ptolemaeus and Theodotus), Father (Ptolemaeus and Valentinus), Beginning (Ptolemaeus), Mind (Ptolemaeus), Logos (Marcus and Tractatus Tripartitus), ⁽¹⁸⁾ Son (Tractatus Tripartitus), and in the Gospel of Truth, although there is no account of any emanation of Aeons, the Father has one who reveals him: the Son. ⁽¹⁹⁾

The relationship between the Father who is revealed and the one who reveals him requires closer examination. The structure of the Pleroma in the systems of Ptolemaeus and Theodotus is rather more elaborate than in our other

17. The list that follows is illustrative and is not intended to be exhaustive. On Only-Begotten in the Apocryphon of John see above, pp. 333ff.
18. There is some confusion in the system of Marcus, for Logos is the direct emanation of the Father (adv. haer. I xiv 1; H. i 129), and also the first Aeon of the second tetrad (adv. haer. I xv 1; H. i 145). The explanation for this is probably to be found in what Sagnard calls the law of communication among the Aeons; see below, p. 386. In the Tractatus Tripartitus the name Logos is used of the Son who is the direct emanation of the Father (Trac. Trip. 60.34ff.), but is usually the name of the last of the Aeons - Sophia in the other systems.
19. See above p. 355.

sources, and the relationship between the Father and his emanations, especially his Son, is that much more complicated. In the Gospel of Truth the relationship between the revealer and the revealed is expressed in a long passage on the Name of the Son.⁽²⁰⁾ The section is introduced by what immediately precedes: 'But the end is to receive knowledge of him who is hidden; and that one is the Father, from whom came the beginning, (and) to whom will return all those who came forth from him. And they were revealed for the glory and joy of his Name.'⁽²¹⁾ The similarities between this and the emanation of the Aeons discussed above are obvious. Once again we should note that the drama begins, and indeed ends, with the Father, and the drama

20. Ev. Ver. 38.6 - 40.29. There are detailed discussions of the speculation on the Name by Daniélou, in The Theology of Jewish Christianity, pp. 157 - 60; Quispel, in The Jung Codex, pp. 64 - 76, esp. pp. 72ff.; Arai, op. cit., pp. 62 - 72; and J.E. Ménard, 'Les élucubrations de l'Evangelium Veritatis sur le "Nom"', in Studia Montis Regii 5(1962), pp. 185 - 214. Daniélou, Quispel and Ménard all emphasize the Jewish origins of the speculation. Cf. 'Il semble bien, . . . que ce soit une pensée sémitique et plus spécialement juive et biblique qui ait influencé les auteurs gnostiques et l'auteur de l'Évangile de Vérité dans leurs savantes et pieuses élucubrations sur le Nom propre de Dieu' (Ménard, art. cit., p. 214).
21. Ev. Ver. 37.37 - 38.6. Grobel, op. cit., n. 548, regards the phrase 'and that one is the Father' as an interpolation.

itself is a drama of revelation of the Father. Since the Father is eternal and no-one brought him into existence, there was no-one to give a name to the Father (cf. 39.28 - 40.2). However, it is the Father who 'in the beginning, gave a name to the one who came forth from himself, who was himself, and he begot him as a Son' (38.7 - 11). The Son, then, is the same as the Father, and at the same time distinct from him in that the Father is unbegotten, but the Son is begotten. The Father alone is capable of giving a name to the Son since he alone sees him (39.7 - 10). The Name which the Father gives is not simply a naming of the Son, for 'the Name of the Father is the Son.'⁽²²⁾ This becomes clear from the fact that the name is the Father's name,⁽²³⁾ for the name is the expression of the essential character, and the Son whom the Father begets is the same as the Father. Consequently, the Father both bestows a

22. Ev. Ver. 38.6f. Grobel, op. cit., n. 551, considers that this also may be an interpolation. For the Son as the name of the Father, cf. Exc. ex Theod. 26.1; 31.4; and Ev. Ph. para. 12.

23. Ev. Ver. 39.11 - 16. 'He who does not exist has no name' (Not, as in the editio princeps, 'The Unbegotten has no name'. See Till, in Orientalia 27(1958), p. 280, ad loc.). Cf. Ev. Ver. 21.28 - 30. See also Grobel, op. cit., n. 578.

name on the Son, and the Son is the Father's name; i.e. the son is begotten by the Father as the true representation of the Father's character. Hence, 'He (sc. the Father) has given him (sc. the Son) his (sc. the Father's) name, which belongs to him (sc. the Father); to him, that is to the Father, to whom belongs everything beside him. He has the name, he has the Son' (38.11 - 15). Or, as it is expressed elsewhere: 'Thus the name is the Father's, just as the name of the Father is the Son' (39.24 - 26). The significance of this from the point of view of salvation drama (or better here, revelation drama) is that the Son is not simply the bearer of the revelation of the Father, he is himself the revelation. The authenticity of the revelation is guaranteed by the fact that the Son is the authentic name that comes from the Father (40.5 - 14); he is 'the Lordly Name (ΠΛΑΙCΙC ΝΡΕΝ)'.⁽²⁴⁾ On the other hand, the Father's sovereignty is maintained by the fact that the name cannot be named or spoken 'until the moment when he, the perfect one, pronounces it alone' (40.16 - 20).

In the Tractatus Tripartitus, although the structure of the Pleroma is slightly different,⁽²⁵⁾ the close

24. Ev. Ver. 40.8f., 14. The underlying Greek was probably τὸ κύριον ὄνομα (see the editio princeps, ad loc.) and this suggests a play on words involving the conventional phrase 'the proper name', 'the genuine name', but also recalling the title 'Lord' so frequent in Hellenistic-Jewish and Christian circles. See Grobel, op. cit., n. 589.
25. Where we have fairly complete accounts of the emanations of the Aeons in our extant sources a comparatively

relationship between the Father and Son is also stressed,⁽²⁶⁾ as is the unique status of the Son as the Father's offspring: he is both First-Born and Only-Begotten: 'the First-Born, because there was nothing before him; the Only-Begotten, because there was no other after him' (57.20 - 23). Marcus too emphasises the unique role of the Logos by means of his arithmology: The Logos bears the name $\alpha\rho\chi\eta$ the four letters of which represent two tetrads, a decad and a duo-decad. In short the whole Pleroma depends on Logos, who is the form ($\muορφη$) of the invisible.⁽²⁷⁾

25. (contd.) uniform picture emerges. The Pleroma comprises thirty Aeons arranged in syzygies. At the head is the primal Father who with three other Aeons, including Only-Begotten form the first tetrad, and the second tetrad begins with Logos, and includes the Aeons Man and Church. In the Tractatus Tripartitus, however, no mention is made of tetrads or ogdoads (there is possibly a reference to a pentad or a triad - 60.1) but the text is uncertain; see the editio princeps, p. 292), and the Aeons are said to be innumerable (59.6ff., 70.24), and the concept of syzygies plays no part in the Pleroma. Moreover, the Father, his Son and the Church make up a triad at the head of the Pleroma.

26. Trac. Trip. 56.23 - 30; 58.37 - 59.1; 62.33 - 39.

27. adv. haer. I xiv 1; H. i 130f.

A considerable amount of light is shed on the structure and the development of the Pleroma in the slightly more complicated system of Ptolemaeus by Ptolemaeus's exegesis of the Prologue of St. John's Gospel. (28) The ἀρχή is Only-Begotten, 'in whom the Father emanated everything in seed form (σπερματικῶς)', (29) Only-Begotten emanated Logos 'and in him the whole substance of the Aeons'. (30) The relationship between the Father, Only-Begotten and Logos, the distinction in unity and the order of emanation, can best be grasped from the connected exegesis of Ptolemaeus: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God" (Jn. 1.1f.). First he distinguishes the three, God, Beginning (i.e. ἀρχή = Only-Begotten) and Word, then he unites them, so as to show both the emanation of each of them, of the Son (= ἀρχή = Only-Begotten) and the Logos, and also their unity with each other and with the Father (πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, i.e. πρὸς τὸν θεόν). For the Beginning (ἀρχή = Only-Begotten)

28. adv. haer. I viii 5; H. i 75 - 80.

29. adv. haer. I viii 5; H. i 76.

30. ibid. Cf. "All things came into existence through it, and apart from it nothing came into existence" (Jn 1.3): To all the Aeons after it the Logos was the cause of formation and origin' (adv. haer. I viii 5; H. i 77). It should be noted that Logos has a fairly important position in both the system of Ptolemaeus and that of Marcus.

was in the Father and from ($\varepsilon\kappa$) the Father, and the Logos was in the Beginning ($\varepsilon\nu \acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\eta$ = in Only-Begotten) and from the Beginning. Therefore he (sc. John) has well said, "In the beginning was the Logos", for he was in the Son (= $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\eta$ = Only-Begotten), and "the Logos was with God", for so was the Beginning ($\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\eta$ = Only-Begotten);⁽³¹⁾ and consequently "the Logos was God", for that which is begotten from God is God. "He was in the Beginning with God." (By this) he shows the order of the emanation.⁽³²⁾ In this section it is to be noted that the relationships are described by an extremely precise use of words.

It is also important to consider the relationship between the primary Aeons, notably the primal Father and the Son or Only-Begotten, and the rest of the Pleroma. Here again Ptolemaeus's exegesis of the Johannine Prologue throws a lot of light on the matter. The precise relationship that exists in a syzygy is shown by Ptolemaeus's exegesis of the phrase "That which came into being in him was Life" (Jn 1.4): Again the exegesis depends on the precise meaning of terms. All things came into existence 'through him ($\delta\iota' \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$)', but Life came into existence 'in Him ($\varepsilon\nu \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$)'. 'This (sc. Life) which was "in him" is more closely related ($\omicron\iota\kappa\epsilon\iota\omicron\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha$) to him than those things that came into being "through him", for it (sc. Life) is with him, and bears fruit through him.'⁽³³⁾ Thus we have the syzygy Logos-Life.

31. If the Logos is with God and in Only-Begotten, then Only-Begotten must also be with God.

32. adv. haer. I viii 5; H. i 76f. Cf. Exc. ex Theod. 6.3, 4.

33. adv. haer. I viii 5; H. i 77f.

The relationship is in fact so close that the syzygy can be designated by only one of its members. Thus when John says "The life was the light of men" (Jn 1.4), Ptolemaeus sees in this the emanation of the syzygy Man and Church from Logos and Life, for 'to be the light of' means 'to enlighten', that is, 'to form and make manifest', and through Life the Logos forms and makes manifest Man and Church.⁽³⁴⁾ In Theodotus the pair that constitute a syzygy are treated as a single entity. So a syzygy is something much closer than the idea of one independent unit within another unit. Life is to be encountered in the Logos, and hence the Logos can be said to be life; truth is to be encountered in the Only-Begotten and hence Only-Begotten is in a real sense truth itself.⁽³⁵⁾ Marcus, as may be expected, expresses the point by a subtle interpretation of letters and numbers.⁽³⁶⁾

34. adv. haer. I viii 5; H. i 78.

35. Exc. ex Theod. 6.3; 4; 32.1.

36. One example will suffice: Marcus is shown the Aeon Truth. Truth has a body, the 24 letters of the alphabet, and this body is called Man. Man, then, is the embodiment of the truth and is 'the source of all Logos and the beginning of all voice, and the expression of every thing inexpressible, and the mouth of silent Silence' (adv. haer. I xiv 3; H. i 134f.). Man as the embodiment of Truth occupies a place similar to that of Only-Begotten in Ptolemaeus. At the same time, Man is also the consort of Church (adv. haer. I xiv 5; H. i 137; I xv 1; H. i 145). This apparent confusion attests the subtlety of the relationships in the Pleroma, whereby one Aeon may bear the names of other Aeons and a later Aeon may include in itself the power of earlier Aeons. See below, p. 386.

A long section of the Tractatus Tripartitus (59.6 - 75.13) is devoted to a description of the relationship between the Father and the Aeons, with occasional references to the role of the Logos-Son. It is the very super-abundance of the Father's greatness that overflows in emanations (59.36ff.). But the coming into existence of the Aeons means neither a diminution of the Father nor the creation of a kind of pantheon of divine beings. The Aeons were in the Father's thought,⁽³⁷⁾ and the author of the Tractatus Tripartitus employs a number of images to convey the relationship between the Father and the Aeons whom he emanates from himself. Emanation does not mean that the Aeons become separate beings cut off from each other and from the one who begets them; 'their begetting is like an unfolding; the Father unfolds himself to whomever he wishes' (73.23ff.). The relationship is as of the divisions of time to the unity of time (73.28 - 74.3), or of water to the spring from which it comes,⁽³⁸⁾ or of the roots to the tree (74.10 - 13), or of the limbs to the body (74.13 - 18). There is no envy between the Father and the All, because the Father is in the All begetting and revealing himself.⁽³⁹⁾ Some interesting light is shed on the term 'the All' too and its use as a collective term for the Aeons. The Aeons are not to be thought of as individual units, they are all one; the Father is the All, and he is in each one, but without any

37. Trac. Trip. 60.1 - 3, 16f.; cf. 60.10f; cf. Ev. Ver. 19.8 - 10; 37.7 - 14.

38. Trac. Trip. 74.5 - 10; cf. 60.13ff.; 62.8ff.

39. Trac. Trip. 70.25 - 31; cf. 63.12f.

division.⁽⁴⁰⁾ So the author strives after the idea of diversity in unity, and the term 'the All' helps to stress the idea of unity and identity.

While the Aeons remain hidden in the Depth of the Father they are known by that Depth, but they themselves know neither the Depth in which they are, nor themselves, nor each other; they are like seeds.⁽⁴¹⁾ The Logos brought them forth from the Father like seeds in order to give them a genuine existence both for the Father and for themselves.⁽⁴²⁾ Here again we meet the role of the Logos-Son as a primary agent in the emanation of the Aeons. Not only is the Son the agent of emanation, he is also the agent of revelation and indeed, the revelation itself.⁽⁴³⁾ The two functions are closely related, for in bringing forth the Aeons as seeds from the Father, the Logos showed grace, 'to give the first formation (*φόρμη*),⁽⁴⁴⁾ that they might consider who is the Father who exists for them' (61.11 - 13). He '[gave] form (*μορφή*) [to know] the one who is' (62.1f.). This giving of form means that the Aeons have a desire to seek the Father.⁽⁴⁵⁾ Behind this seeking lies a plan of the Father: although through their first forming the Aeons have a desire to seek the Father they are still in need of 'knowledge and increase and faultlessness' (62.12 - 14).

40. Trac. Trip. 66.30 - 67.14. Cf. below, p.369 on the Gospel of Truth.

41. Trac. Trip. 60.14 - 34. Cf. Ev. Ver. 19.8 - 10; 27.22 - 25.

42. Trac. Trip. 60.34 - 61.4. Cf. Ev. Ver. 37.7 - 14.

43. See above, p.354.

44. A metathesis of *μορφή* under the influence of the Latin

The Father, who had their perfection from the beginning, did not give it to them at once lest they should think that they had their perfection by their own right and not from the Father.⁽⁴⁶⁾ So the Father delayed giving it to them. There is another reason for the delay; a reason that is closely linked with the Father's self-revelation: The Father is incomprehensible and 'if he had revealed himself beforehand, suddenly to all those exalted Aeons ($\alpha\iota\omega\upsilon$) who came forth from him, they would have perished' (64.33 - 37).⁽⁴⁷⁾ However, it is the Father's will to reveal himself and hence the two themes work together: the Father intends to reveal himself little by little, and the Aeons seek the Father who possesses their perfection. To assist the Aeons in their search for the Father, the Father gives them faith, prayer, hope, love, understanding, wisdom and blessing (71.23 - 35). The Father works in the All through his Spirit⁽⁴⁸⁾ to make them seek him, and they are drawn to him as to a perfume.⁽⁴⁹⁾ Through the Father's spirit at work in them the Aeons 'became worthy to know him (sc. the Father), that (or 'for'; Coptic: $\chi\epsilon$) He is unnameable and incomprehensible' (73.1 - 4).

Quite apart from the similarities in detail between

44. (contd.) 'forma'.

45. Trac. Trip. 61.24 - 28; cf. 71.8 - 18. Cf. Ev. Ver. 17.4 - 9.

46. Trac. Trip. 62.14 - 26. Cf. Ev. Ver. 18.36 - 19.9.

47. Trac. Trip. 57.26f.; 71.13 - 18.

48. Trac. Trip. 71.35 - 72.5; 72.17 - 19; 73.1 - 8.

49. Trac. Trip. 71.35 - 72.19. Cf. Ev. Ver. 33.39 - 34.32.

the section of the Tractatus Tripartitus which we have just been discussing and sections of the Gospel of Truth,⁽⁵⁰⁾ there is an important similarity with regard to the revelation drama. In most of the documents we are considering the drama is set out on a cosmic scale, as though the world of the Aeons were 'up there'. In the Tractatus Tripartitus, however, we have seen that the Aeons are in the Father, therefore their seeking after him is not so much a journey 'upwards' as a journey 'inwards' to self-knowledge and self-understanding. The drama is depicted more as a movement in thought and understanding than a movement in space. This impression is substantiated by an examination of the Gospel of Truth, for there it is obvious that the drama moves on at least two levels at once. This can be demonstrated by an examination of some of the terms found in the work. It is perhaps most clearly seen in relation to the concept of 'the All'.⁽⁵¹⁾ 'The All searched for him from whom they came forth and the All was within him' (17.5 - 7). It is not simply the case that the All are seeking for the one from whom they came, within whom

50. See the cross-references above, nn. 37 - 49.

51. See H.L. Jansen, 'Der Begriff ΠΤΗΡΥ, "Das All", im Evangelium Veritatis', in Acta Orientalia 31(1968), pp. 115 - 18. 'The All' does not mean 'totality of creatures' (Grobel, op. cit., n. 20) nor 'the universe' (ibid., n. 71) since material things come from Error, whereas the All comes from the Father. Cf. also Jonas, in Gnomon 32(1960), pp. 33lf., and A.C. Robison, art. cit., p. 236.

they once were, as the next passage shows: 'But He, he found them in himself, and they, they found him in themselves, that inconceivable, incomprehensible (one), the perfect Father who produced the All, in whom the All was and whom the All needed, since he retained their perfection in himself. Not that the Father is jealous; what jealousy can there be between him and his members' (18.29 - 40). Even more clearly in the Gospel of Truth than in the Tractatus Tripartitus, in a real sense there is no movement of the drama as such since the All discovers where it has been all along. At the same time, in the continuation of this last passage there is talk of a return: 'He retains their perfection within himself and gives it to them that they may return to him and know him with a uniquely perfect knowledge.'⁽⁵²⁾ Later this return is even described as a re-ascension.⁽⁵³⁾ Thus the movement is at once a realization within the Father and a return to the Father of that which came from him. It is also to be observed that the movement finds its root in the will of the Father just as in the Tractatus Tripartitus the Father retains the perfection of the Aeons that they may seek him.⁽⁵⁴⁾ It is in this context that the work of the redeemer in the Gospel of Truth is to be seen in part: it is he who causes the All to return to the Father (23.33 - 24.9). To the work of the redeemer and to the 'external' drama we shall return in

52. Ev. Ver. 19.3 - 7; cf. Grobel, op. cit., n. 79 on perfection as gift and as return.

53. Ev. Ver. 21.7 - 11, 18 - 21.

54. Trac. Trip. 62.14 - 26.

our later sections, but the complex nature of the movement of the All is indisputable. The complexity of the movement can also be demonstrated from a study of other terms: Aeons, Spaces (*ΜΑΕΙΤ*),⁽⁵⁵⁾ Emanations (*†Η*),⁽⁵⁶⁾ and Fragrance.⁽⁵⁷⁾

55. The word usually means, way, path, or road, but on at least two occasions (Ev. Ver. 20.35; 22.22) the meaning 'place' or 'space' seems assured (a meaning common in Bohairic). See further, Grobel, *op. cit.*, n. 113. Cf. Ménard, in RevSR 44(1970), pp. 132f.
56. The precise meaning of *†Η* is uncertain. See the editio princeps, p. 54, and Ménard, L'Évangile de Vérité, pp. 112f., who translates: 'Emanation'. Cf. Grobel (*op. cit.*, n. 171) who conjectures that the word is a new form of Akhmimic *ΤΑΕΙΕ*, meaning 'parts', 'shares', 'portions'. Arai (*op. cit.*, pp. 46f.) regards it as coming from an Egyptian root, and meaning 'form' or 'image' (Gestalt, Abbild).
57. The spaces are identified with the Father's emanations (Ev. Ver. 27.10f. The text reads *†*. In the editio princeps this is understood to be a variant of *†Η*; Grobel translates: 'gifts'.). 'They knew him, since they came from him as sons from a perfect man. They knew him since they had not received form (*μορφή*), and had not received a name, each one of which the Father produced. Then they received form (*φύσις*) and knowledge of him. For although they are in him they do not know him' (Ev. Ver. 27.11 - 23; cf. 20.19 - 22. The sentence structure of this passage is uncertain. On the first two sentences see Till, in ZNTW 50(1959), p. 175, *ad. loc.*, and on the third see Till, in Orientalia 27 (1958), p. 276, *ad. loc.* The form *φύσις* betrays Latin influence (see above, n. 44, but not necessarily 'knowledge of Latin' (Grobel, *op. cit.*, n. 278).). The movement takes place within the Father and the Father makes the necessary revelation which gives the 'Spaces' their

To return to the drama within the Pleroma; this drama is better described as a revelation drama than as a salvation drama at this point though the seeds of disaster that will turn it into a drama in which salvation is necessary are already present, even if not yet openly active. The unknowable and incomprehensible Father brings forth from himself a number of emanations and intends to reveal himself

57. (contd.) true identity in form and name. This is supported by what follows. The Father knows what is within him and he can make anything manifest when he wills by giving form and name to it. The Father knows what he is going to produce, but the fruit produced does not know (Ev. Ver. 27.23 - 28.10). 'In this way also every space which is in the Father comes from the one who is, the one who himself established it from that which is not' (Ev. Ver. 28.10 - 15.). In another passage there seems to be a clearer distinction between an original existence in the Father and a subsequent fall from him through ignorance: 'It is a great marvel that they were in the Father without knowing him, and that they were able to escape of their own volition, since they could not understand and know him in whom they were' (Ev. Ver. 22.27 - 33). In a similar way the emanations (?) (†H) are described as Pleromas (Ev. Ver. 41.15f.), and 'all his emanations (?) have their roots in the one who caused them all to grow in himself. He gave them their destinies' (Ev. Ver. 41.16 - 20). Once again any movement seems to take place in the Father, but the text goes on to state that the emanations (?) extend their thought to their root, 'which bears them above in all the heights to the Father' (Ev. Ver. 41.26 - 28). The fragrances also return to their place of origin, the first fragrance that had grown cold (Ev. Ver. 34.14 - 18).

to them and bestow on them their perfection. In this there are two lines of tension evident: the revelation of the ineffable; the withholding of the perfection. Both of these appear together in the Tractatus Tripartitus and the Gospel of Truth; in Ptolemaeus only the former appears, and there it is strengthened by the restraint placed on Only-Begotten by Silence. In the Pleroma, the first of the Father's emanations is in a unique relationship with the Father and is the foundation for all further emanations. The first emanation also has an important role in the revelation of the Father to the remaining Aeons, even though, for the Father's good purpose, the revelation is to be gradual.⁽⁵⁸⁾

The tension that is evident in the Pleroma leads almost inevitably to the next stage of the Valentinian drama, and it takes us beyond the Pleroma at times. The precise details of the fall of the last of the Aeons do not concern us here except in so far as they lay the foundation for the successive stages of the drama⁽⁵⁹⁾ and lead us to a consideration of the origins of the Saviour in the Valentinian systems.

58. Cf. 'Daran schliesst sich nun aber der Anfang des Dramas an. Von allen Aonen ist nur noch der Nus im Stande, den verborgenen Vater zu schauen, zu begreifen und darin selig zu sein' (Müller, art. cit., p. 207, cf. ibid., pp. 222ff.). Cf. also 'Through the innate imperfection of the aeons the whole procedure of fall from and return to the Father becomes possible' (J. Zandee, 'Gnostic Ideas on the fall and salvation', in Numen 11(1964), pp. 13 - 74; quotation from p. 23).

59. Cf. 'Ohne den Fall der Sophia keine Geschichte!' (J. Zandee, 'Die Person der Sophia in der vierten Schrift des

In the documents at our disposal we are faced here with two differing forms of the basic myth, one form being found in Ptolemaeus, and the other in the remaining documents.⁽⁶⁰⁾ We may call these forms A and B respectively. Form B is described most fully in the Tractatus Tripartitus, and it shall serve as the basis of discussion here.

The last Aeon to be brought forth⁽⁶¹⁾ transgresses the limit concerning speaking in the Pleroma, which is that the Aeons should remain silent about the Father's incomprehensibility and speak only of the wish to comprehend him.⁽⁶²⁾ The last of the Aeons, then, attempted to know the unknowable.⁽⁶³⁾ This striving for the impossible leads to disaster.⁽⁶⁴⁾ In some accounts of form B there is another

59. (contd.) Codex Jung', in Origini pp. 203 - 12, quotation from p. 204).

60. But cf. n. 66 below.

61. The last Aeon is not named by Marcus, is called the Mother (sc. of Christ) by Valentinus, Sophia by Ptolemaeus and Theodotus, and logos by the author of the Tractatus Tripartitus.

62. Trac. Trip. 75.13 - 17.

63. Trac. Trip. 75.17 - 19; 76.12 - 16, 25 - 27. Cf. adv. haer. I ii 2; H. i 13 - 15, Exc. ex Theod. 31.3.

64. Trac. Trip. 76.6ff. Foerster observes that the 'Fall' of Sophia consists in two things: Her passionate enthusiasm to comprehend the Father is at variance with the repose of the Pleroma; She wishes to have direct and immediate knowledge of the Father, which is reserved for Only-Begotten. (W. Foerster, 'Die Grundzüge der ptolemaeischen Gnosis', in NTS 6(1959-60), pp. 16 - 31, see esp. pp. 20 - 22).

reason also for the fall of this Aeon: that it tries to produce a work on its own without the assistance of its consort or the other Aeons.⁽⁶⁵⁾ As a result of this action there appears a rift in the Pleroma and the last Aeon is separated from the rest,⁽⁶⁶⁾ and all the Aeons are

65. adv. haer. I ii 2; H. i 13 - 15 (Ptolemaeus) and Exc. ex Theod. 31.4; 32.1 (Theodotus). A suggestion of the same theme occurs in the Tractatus Tripartitus when it is stated that if the Aeons do not work in harmony a mere likeness results instead of something perfect (68. 17 - 21). In the Apocryphon of John the disaster occurs because Sophia desired to bring forth from herself and did so without the consent of her consort or the primal Father. The unilateral action of Sophia is a common theme, therefore, but the idea of knowledge, or rather the desire for knowledge is more dominant in Valentinian Gnosticism. However, even in the Apocryphon of John, Sophia's wish to bring forth is in imitation of the primal Father.

66. Trac. Trip. 76.30 - 34. Here there is no doubt whatsoever that the logos falls outside the Pleroma, and this is also clearly the case in the system of Valentinus (adv. haer. I xi 1; H. i 100). In the case of Theodotus and Marcus it is by no means clear whether they follow this scheme or that of form A in which Sophia remains within the Pleroma and only her Passion is excluded (See below on Ptolemaeus who is clearly form A - pp.383ff). For Theodotus the evidence is inconclusive. On the one hand, Christ is said to stem from the Mother outside the Pleroma (Exc. ex Theod. 23.2; 32.3), which suggests an affinity with Valentinus and the Tractatus Tripartitus, and therefore one Sophia only, not an upper and a lower Sophia (the passion of Sophia that is called Achamoth), but on the other hand, Christ is said to spring from the Thought of Sophia (Exc. ex Theod. 32.3; 33.3), which

disturbed.⁽⁶⁷⁾ The Tractatus Tripartitus makes it clear that the action of Logos⁽⁶⁸⁾ is possible because of the gift

66. (contd.) recalls the Passion of Sophia which was removed from the Pleroma as in the system of Ptolemaeus. Casey (op. cit., p. 16) and Sagnard (La gnose val., p. 540) maintain that the section under discussion presupposes two Sophiae, as in Ptolemaeus (and therefore the Aeon Sophia does not fall outside the Pleroma); C. Barth, op. cit., pp. 10f., and G.C. Stead, in 'The Valentinian Myth of Sophia', in JTS n.s. 20(1969), pp. 75 - 104, see pp. 84f., consider that the evidence points to only one Sophia as in Valentinus. With regard to Marcus the evidence is perhaps even less conclusive. On the one hand it is said that 'that which was established in the Father descended, being sent forth to the one from whom he was separated' (adv. haer. I xiv 5; H. i 138), which suggests that Christ was not emanated within the Pleroma, but from the Mother when she had been excluded from the Pleroma. On the other hand it is said that the last letter (the last Aeon) produced its own sound and 'the echo of it, going out, brought into being its own elements . . . but the letter itself . . . was received up again by the syllable to which it belonged for the completion of the whole, but the sound remained below as if excluded' (adv. haer. I xiv 2; H. i 132). Is the echo the equivalent of Sophia's passion that is excluded? Yet the letter is taken up again as though it had fallen outside; i.e. as though Sophia had left the Pleroma and then returned. The problem cannot easily be resolved and indeed may be expressed in another form: Christ clearly originates from outside the Pleroma in the system of Marcus, but is he from Sophia or the lower Sophia, Achamoth? One ought perhaps to allow for a conflation of ideas that have been incompletely reconciled.

67. Trac. Trip. 85.33 - 37; Exc. ex Theod. 31.4.

of free-will⁽⁶⁹⁾ and furthermore the fall is not some inexplicable disaster, but is 'a cause of a dispensation (*οἰκονομία*) which had been appointed to come about'.⁽⁷⁰⁾ Here, then, we have an explicit reference to the fact that the drama that occurs does so not because of the working of blind fate or some other malign force, but because God planned it so. The term *οἰκονομία* occurs at other points in the Tractatus Tripartitus, but here it clearly refers to the order of events in the drama and in particular the fall of the last Aeon.⁽⁷¹⁾ Sophia in her state of alienation

68. I.e. Sophia. The term Sophia will be used for the last of the Aeons unless specific reference is being made to the Tractatus Tripartitus. On the background to the Sophia-myth see G.C. Stead, art. cit.; J. Zandee, art. cit., in Origini, pp. 203 - 12; G. MacRae, 'The Jewish Background of the Gnostic Sophia myth', in NT 12(1970), pp. 86 - 101.

69. Trac. Trip. 75.35 - 76.2; cf. Ev. Ver. 22.29f.

70. Trac. Trip. 77.9 - 11; cf. the whole section 76.34 - 77.11.

71. In Valentinian Gnosticism the term *οἰκονομία* is principally used to designate the sphere controlled by the Demiurge. So, e.g., in the Tractatus Tripartitus it is said that the Saviour is wisdom for the logos against those under the *οἰκονομία* (Trac. Trip. 94.6 - 8) and the logos is kept apart from the exalted ones until the *οἰκονομία* outside is prepared (Trac. Trip. 96.12 - 15; cf. 101.10f.). Further evidence is supplied by a comment of Irenaeus that the Valentinians regarded the Demiurge as the Lord and creator of the plan of creation (adv. haer. III xi 2; H. ii 42). In particular this point becomes clear in the numerous references to the psychic body (provided by the Demiurge for the Saviour when he descends) as 'the Jesus of the *οἰκονομία*' (e.g. adv.

brings forth, and produces first two different kinds of beings: there is the perfect, single Aeon, and there are

71. (contd.) haer. I vi 1; H. i 52; I vii 2; H. i 61f.; I xi 3; H. i 85; I xv 3; H. i 150f.; III x 4; H. ii 36f.; III xi 3; H. ii 42; III xvi 1; H. ii 82; III xvi 6; H. ii 87; III xvii 1; H. ii 92). To this point we shall return when considering the Valentinian Christology. The term *οἰκονομία* also refers to the fact that the Demiurge arranged the lower world after the image of the arrangement in the Pleroma. So, according to Marcus the letters of the alphabet are a true representation of the *οἰκονομία* above (adv. haer. I xvi 2; H. i 160), and man is arranged in the image of things above (adv. haer. I xiv 9; H. i 144). In any case the Demiurge does not make the plan himself for, as the Tractatus Tripartitus makes clear, the logos is entrusted with the *οἰκονομία* of all who exist (Trac. Trip. 95.20 - 22). There is, then an *οἰκονομία* within the Pleroma itself: according to Marcus the Saviour is the fruit of the *οἰκονομία* of the Aeons (adv. haer. I xiv 6; H. i 139; cf. I xv 3; H. i 151 - though this may refer to the Jesus of the Dispensation, the psychic body of the Saviour), and the Tractatus Tripartitus states that the Saviour directed the *οἰκονομία* of the All (Trac. Trip. 88.4f.). Beyond these references to the arrangement of things in order there are also references to the arrangement of events; i.e. what in another context would be called salvation history. Marcus maintains that as man was formed on the sixth day, so the last man appeared on the sixth day, in accordance with the *οἰκονομία* (adv. haer. I xiv 6; H. i 140), therefore, too, Christ was crucified at the sixth hour (*ibid.*). So too in the Tractatus Tripartitus there are several references to the fact that the fall of the logos, the formation of the hylics even, the union of the pneumatic with his All, and the Demiurge and his angels are useful for the *οἰκονομία* to come (Trac. Trip. 77.1 - 11; 89.35f.; 95.6 - 9; 99.

the 'shadows, images (εἰδωλον) and likenesses' that result from the fact that Sophia, on looking at the light, became doubtful. (72) The perfect one had no affinity with the others and abandoned them to rise upwards into the pleroma to those with whom he did have an affinity, that is, the Aeons in the Pleroma. (73) The systems of Theodotus and Valentinus identify this one who ascends into the Pleroma as Christ. (74)

71. (contd.) 19; 103.1f.), and this cannot refer simply to the construction of the lower world, but must mean also the redemptive purpose for which it was made, with a view to the eventual restoration of the Pleroma. The term *οἰκονομία* is here on the way to becoming a technical term for the salvation drama. See also Zandee, art. cit., Numen 11(1964), pp. 65f. and A. Orbe La Union de Verbo. Estudios Valentinianos III (Rome, 1961; = Anal. Greg. 113), pp. 211f. quoted in A. Grillmeier, Christ in Christian Tradition, pp. 132f.
72. Trac. Trip. 77.11 - 20; cf. Exc. ex Theod. 31.3. Cf. the Apocryphon of John in which Sophia becomes distressed only when she sees what she has produced.
73. Trac. Trip. 77.37 - 78.7; cf. 78.13 - 19. A slightly different account is given in this same section of the work, in which the logos, on bringing forth the perfect one was himself left weak and as though abandoned by the male element and therefore could only bring forth mere shadows and likenesses after that (Trac. Trip. 78.8 - 16; cf. 80.30 - 81.3. Cf. below on Valentinus and Theodotus).
74. Exc. ex Theod. 32.2 etc.; adv. haer. I xi 1; H. i 100. This Aeon is not named in the Tractatus Tripartitus, but is referred to as 'the one who ran upwards' (Trac. Trip. 78.2, 18f., 23; 85.22f.; 86.8).

What Valentinus and Theodotus say about this Christ who ascends into the Pleroma is important. In Irenaeus's account of the system of Valentinus we have simply the following statement: that Christ 'was brought forth by the Mother, who was outside (sc. the Pleroma), according to her remembrance of the better ones, but with a certain shadow.' Christ is therefore the image of the Pleroma, but because he is male he withdraws from the Mother and runs up into the Pleroma.⁽⁷⁵⁾ The statement of Theodotus is fuller: In her fallen state Sophia produces an image, which is Christ, who comes 'from the thought ($\epsilon\nu\nu\omicron\iota\alpha$) of Sophia and is the image of the Pleroma'.⁽⁷⁶⁾ It is because he is an image of the Pleroma that he rises into it, but because he stems from the Mother in her fallen state he is Son by adoption ($\nu\iota\acute{o}\theta\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$), being elected into his place, and he is First-born ($\pi\rho\omega\tau\acute{o}\tau\omicron\kappa\omicron\varsigma$) of things outside the Pleroma.⁽⁷⁷⁾ There is, therefore, at least in form B of the drama, a clear link between the Pleroma, the fall from the Pleroma and the things outside the Pleroma.

If we follow the activity of this Christ we are led directly to the emanation of the Saviour. The events may be summarised as follows: Having entered the Pleroma, Christ

75. adv. haer. I xi 1; H. i 100.

76. Exc. ex Theod. 32.2.

77. Exc. ex Theod. 33.1.

begs for help for Sophia, and as a result of the assent of the Aeons (this assent marks the restoration of the Pleroma), Jesus is sent out as a Paraclete to the Aeon that had gone astray.⁽⁷⁸⁾ This Jesus is 'full of Aeons' (πλήρης τῶν Αἰώνων), since he proceeded from all;⁽⁷⁹⁾ in particular he is the product of Christ and is the light.⁽⁸⁰⁾ This summary is taken from Theodotus, but considerably more light is shed on the Saviour by the Tractatus Tripartitus. The perfect emanation of the fallen logos rises into the Pleroma and begs for help for the deficient Aeon.⁽⁸¹⁾ The first important feature of what happens next is the emphasis that is placed on the fact that the Aeons work in harmony to help the one who is deficient.⁽⁸²⁾ The significance of this harmony is explained by an earlier passage in which it is said that the Aeons worked together when they had been emanated to bring forth an honour to the Father, and had they worked one by one they would have produced only a likeness and not an honour worthy of the Father.⁽⁸³⁾ By working all together

78. Exc. ex Theod. 23.1; cf. 41.2. In the Apocryphon of John the primal Father poured out some of the spirit of the Pleroma on Sophia.

79. Exc. ex Theod. 23.1; cf. 31.1.

80. Exc. ex Theod. 41.2.

81. Trac. Trip. 86.8 - 11; cf. 78.19 - 22; 85.22 - 25.

82. Trac. Trip. 86.12 - 15, 23 - 26.

83. Trac. Trip. 68.17 - 21. It must be asked whether this 'honour' is a separate emanation in its own right or a proleptic account of the Saviour, for the 'honour' is later described as 'a first-fruit (ἀπαρχή) of the immortals and an eternal one, because he came forth

the Aeons 'brought forth the fruit ($\kappa\alpha\rho\pi\acute{o}\varsigma$), which was the product of the mutual harmony, a single one which belonged to the All' (86.24 - 27). Because the Aeons were thinking of the Father when they did this, the single one revealed the appearance of the Father (86.27 - 31). This one who was emanated by all the Aeons has a redemptive role: he is like a garment covering the Aeons, for the purpose of perfecting the one who was deficient and for confirming those who were perfect (87.1 - 5). He bears the names, Saviour, Redeemer, the well-pleasing ($\epsilon\upsilon\delta\acute{o}\kappa\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$), the beloved, the one who is entreated (i.e. the Paraclete),⁽⁸⁴⁾ Christ and the light of the appointed (87.6 - 10). Even more important is the obvious parallels between this one and the Son emanated first by the Father. The Redeemer is even called the Son and is 'the knowledge of the Father who willed that they should know him' (87.13 - 17). Whereas the Logos-Son is the source of all the subsequent Aeons, the Redeemer is the product of all the Aeons and is under the authority of the All (87.31 - 36). Despite this the Saviour is said to have directed the administration ($\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\mu\iota\acute{\alpha}$) of the All (88.4 - 6). The arithmology of Marcus attests the same significance for the Saviour.⁽⁸⁵⁾

83. (contd.) from the living aeons' (Trac. Trip. 69.3 - 5).

84. Cf. Ptolemaeus and Theodotus who also identify the Saviour with the Paraclete (adv. haer. I iv 5; H. i 38; Exc. ex Theod. 23.1).

85. The alphabet which represents the Pleroma comprises nine unvoiced letters, eight semi-voiced letters and seven vowels, so 987 is the numerical value of the Aeons in the Pleroma (adv. haer. I xiv 5; H. i 137),

Before we go any further we shall compare with this the form A of the drama so far. The differences between forms A and B can be traced almost entirely to the fact that Ptolemaeus wished to retain a sharp line of demarcation between the Pleroma and whatever lies outside of it. Thus the boundary of the Pleroma, which in the Tractatus Tripartitus (75.13) is simply the limit of speaking about the Father, becomes a separate hypostasis which restrains Sophia in her passion and divides off her Intention (*ἐνθύμησις*) and her suffering from her and with difficulty restores Sophia to herself.⁽⁸⁶⁾ Sophia, then, remains within the Pleroma and only her Intention and Passion are outside the Pleroma, crucified or cut off by Limit (*ὅρος*) or Cross (*σταυρός*).⁽⁸⁷⁾ Under these circumstances Christ cannot

85. (contd.) but this number is unstable and must be equalised by taking one from the nine and adding it to the seven; so 987 is equalised as 888 so that the Pleroma all together 'Brings forth as fruit one power that is from all' (adv. haer. I xiv 5; H. i 138), and this is the Saviour, the fruit of the Pleroma. The numerical value of the name Jesus is also 888, the number of the equalised Pleroma (*Ἰησοῦς*: 10 + 8 + 200 + 70 + 400 + 200 = 888). The Saviour is also related to elements within the Pleroma. The Saviour is the decad since iota, the initial letter of *Ἰησοῦς* has the numerical value ten (adv. haer. I xv 2; H. i 148). He is also the tetrad since the sum of the first four figures is ten (1 + 2 + 3 + 4 = 10 = iota = *Ἰησοῦς*) (ibid.).

86. Limit has two functions: consolidation and separation. Thus it confirms Sophia and separates off her passion. Foerster (Von. Val. zu Her. pp. 52f., 97) considers that, in fact, there were two Limits in the system of

be derived from Sophia outside the Pleroma and rise into it; instead Christ and his consort Holy Spirit are another pair emanated by Only-Begotten.⁽⁸⁸⁾ Thus Christ too has no relationship with things outside the Pleroma and does not beg for help for Sophia; furthermore it is not the Saviour who establishes and confirms the Pleroma, but Christ and the Holy Spirit. They perfected the Aeons: Christ taught them the nature of pairing and gave them the

86. (contd.) Ptolemaeus, since in theme B (Hippolytus) the two functions of consolidation and separation are performed by Christ and Limit respectively. Also, Irenaeus records that the system of Valentinus had two Limits, one between the primal syzygy and the remainder of the Aeons and the other between the Pleroma and what lay outside (adv. haer. I xi 1; H. i 100). In the system of Theodotus Limit separates the world from the Pleroma and has no active function in the system; it simply marks the point of discontinuity between the Pleroma and what lies outside. To pass out of, or into the Pleroma one must cross this boundary, and, for the pneumatics, Jesus is the door through the Limit into the Pleroma (Exc. ex Theod. 22.4; 26.2; 35.1; 42.1).
87. adv. haer. I ii 4; H. i 19. As Sagnard has shown (La gnose val., pp. 247 - 49), the key to understanding the idea of crucifixion here is the statement of St. Paul: 'They who are Christ's . . . have crucified the flesh with its passions and desires' (Gal. 5.24).
88. adv. haer. I ii 5; H. i 20f. G.C. Stead (art. cit., p. 79) sees in the emanation of Christ and the Holy Spirit a possible trace of theme B since the functions of these two are performed by Limit and their addition yields 32 Aeons.

knowledge of the Father, namely that he is unknowable, except through Only-Begotten;⁽⁸⁹⁾ the Holy Spirit taught them to give thanks and explained what the true Rest was.⁽⁹⁰⁾ In their joy the Aeons all hymned the Forefather, and working together in harmony, each Aeon contributing his best, they produced another emanation to the glory of Depth; 'this was the most perfect beauty and the star of the Pleroma, its perfect fruit, Jesus, who is also called Saviour and Christ and Logos, after his origin, and All, because he is from all.'⁽⁹¹⁾

It seems probable that form A of the drama is a development from form B if only for the reason that Valentinus himself appears to have used form B. The precise relationship of the forms to each other does not concern us here,⁽⁹²⁾ but what is of great importance to us now that we have come to the end of the emanations in the Pleroma is the relationships within the Pleroma. At first sight there appear to be no fewer than three emanations within the Pleroma which to a greater or less degree show characteristics that in 'orthodox' theology are associated with Christ. These three are Only-Begotten, Christ and the Saviour. The names vary in the different

89. adv. haer. I ii 5; H. i 21f.

90. adv. haer. I ii 6; H. i 23.

91. ibid. 'Logos' because the Logos is the 'father of all those who came after' (adv. haer. I i 1; H. i 10).

92. Cf. above n. 66.

accounts, and in the system of Ptolemaeus there is also a fourth figure, Logos, and there seems to be some justification for the complaint of Irenaeus that the Gnostics have divided up Christ into four separate beings.⁽⁹³⁾ Irenaeus was of course writing a polemical treatise, but to regard the emanations in the Pleroma as separate beings ignores what Sagnard refers to as the laws of Valentinian Gnosticism. The first law is what Sagnard calls Communication among the Aeons.⁽⁹⁴⁾ An example of this is filiation among the Aeons; that is that, e.g., the Saviour bears the names and the power of the Aeons within the Pleroma. This can be clearly seen both in the similarities we have observed in the Tractatus Tripartitus between the Son (Only-Begotten in Ptolemaeus) and the Saviour, and more especially in Ptolemaeus's exegesis of the Johannine prologue where he says that the Saviour is 'Son and Truth and Life and Incarnate Logos, "whose glory we beheld, and his glory was such as belongs to the Only-Begotten, given him by the Father, full of Grace and Truth" (Jn 1.14).⁽⁹⁵⁾ 'Truth', 'Life', 'Logos' and 'Only-Begotten' refer of course to the Aeons so named, and from this the full significance of the fact that the Saviour is the product of all the Aeons can be grasped. Then there is the law of envelopment which can be seen again in the Saviour and the fact that he contains within him the Logos of the

93. adv. haer. I ix 2; H. i 82f.

94. La gnose val., pp. 240 - 44.

95. adv. haer. I viii 5; H. i 79f.

Pleroma, and even more explicitly in the fact that he is as a garment for the Aeons.⁽⁹⁶⁾ There is another law that Sagnard speaks of: the law of extension and reabsorption. In fact, in its completeness this involves the whole drama in which all things flow out from the Father and in the end all the spiritual element returns to unity with the Father. In the Pleroma we see the first part of this: the extension. But as we noted with particular reference to the Tractatus Tripartitus,⁽⁹⁷⁾ the emanation within the Pleroma does not lead to the existence of a world of independent divine beings; rather, the emanations are akin to an unfolding of the Father himself. While this particular aspect is noticeable in the Tractatus Tripartitus and the Gospel of Truth⁽⁹⁸⁾ there are signs of it too in Ptolemaeus's system and in Marcus's arithmology.⁽⁹⁹⁾

In its own way, therefore, the Valentinian thinking on the Pleroma is as far from polytheism as the Church's later trinitarian theology is from tritheism. So far as the Valentinian Christology is concerned this means that we must not think of three (or four in the system of

96. Trac. Trip. 87.2ff.

97. See above, p. 366.

98. See above, pp. 364 - 371.

99. For example, in the Ptolemaean system when Christ and the Holy Spirit have stabilised the Pleroma it is said that the Aeons 'became equal in form and in mind, becoming all Minds, all Logoi, all Men, all Christs; similarly all the female Aeons became Truths and Lives and Spirits and Churches' (adv. haer. I ii 6; H. i 23). On Marcus see above n. 36.

Ptolemaeus) divine beings who among them share the work traditionally assigned to Christ (creation, revelation, redemption), but of three expressions of the one divine will to beget, reveal, redeem. In particular the Saviour includes within himself the totality of the Aeons. Of the importance of all these emanations in the Pleroma there can be no doubt: Only-Begotten as the source of all subsequent Aeons and of their knowledge of the Father; the Saviour as the product of all the Aeons and the source of their knowledge of the Father; Christ as the first-fruit of those outside the Pleroma (in form B); Christ as the perfecter of the Aeons (in form A); Logos (in Ptolemaeus,) as the direct emanation of Only-Begotten and the source of all subsequent Aeons and notably of Man and Church.

We return now to the drama. In form B Sophia is outside the Pleroma; in form A only the Intention and Passion of Sophia are outside the Pleroma as a weak female fruit, without shape and ugly, though coming as it did from an Aeon it is a spiritual substance.⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ This spiritual substance is also called Achamoth, a name apparently derived from the Hebrew **חַכְמָה**. There are, then, in form A, an upper and a lower Sophia.⁽¹⁰¹⁾ In

100. adv. haer. I ii 4; H. i 20.

101. According to Ptolemaeus Achamoth is called both Sophia and Holy Spirit: 'Sophia after her father . . . and Holy Spirit from the Spirit with Christ' (adv. haer. I iv 1; H. i 32f. See Sagnard, La gnose val., p. 241 on the Law of filiation). See above n. 66 and cf. Ev. Ph., para. 39: 'Echamoth is one thing and Echmoth another. Echamoth is simply Sophia, but

this form A there is a somewhat awkward bridge between the first stage of the drama in the Pleroma and the second stage with the lower Sophia. Once the Intention and Passion of Sophia have been excluded from the Pleroma and the Aeons have been taught by Christ and have produced the Saviour, there is no compelling reason why the drama should not stop there, apart from the fact that Achamoth, though formless, is a spiritual substance. The drama advances rather artificially as follows: 'The Christ above took pity on her and was extended through the Cross (i.e. Limit) to form her shape by his own power, a shape which was in substance only, not in knowledge. When he had done this, he returned above, withdrawing his power.'⁽¹⁰²⁾

There is much greater coherence in form B in which, as we have seen, Christ left Sophia and rose into the Pleroma and there begs for help for her in her fallen state. In both forms, however, the situation is now the same: Sophia or Achamoth is deserted.

Sophia or Achamoth, now abandoned by Christ, became

101. (contd.) Echmoth is the Sophia of death, which is the one which knows death. It is called the little Sophia.' This feature of two Sophiae Sagnard regards as part of the parallelism which he describes as the second major law of Gnosticism: 'Exemplorisme inversé' (*La gnose val.*, pp. 244 - 49). Stead (art. cit., pp. 81 - 84) finds this too general and considers it more probable that 'the myth of Sophia has been deliberately reconstructed in two stages in order to accommodate inconsistencies in the earlier tradition' (p. 84).

102. adv. haer. I iv 1; H. i 31f.

greatly distressed. In the system of Ptolemaeus the distress arises from the fact that Achamoth attempts to follow Christ into the Pleroma because Christ and the Holy Spirit had left in her an odour of immortality that causes her to desire what is better, but Achamoth is prevented from entering the Pleroma by Limit.⁽¹⁰³⁾ In the Tractatus Tripartitus what follows arises directly from the departure of 'Christ' into the Pleroma; this leaves the logos weak like a woman's nature abandoned by her male element,⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ and the logos, being in such an unstable condition, 'brought forth weak things which were small and hindered by the sicknesses by which he also was impeded.'⁽¹⁰⁵⁾

The emotions play a less important role here than in Ptolemaeus. In Ptolemaeus, Sophia's distress causes her to experience various emotions, grief, fear, terror, and everything in ignorance.⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ From these come ultimately the material world. Then Sophia is converted to the Life-Giver, and from this conversion comes the psychic world.⁽¹⁰⁷⁾

Some interesting details are added by the Tractatus Tripartitus. The conversion comes about because of logos's distress at having brought forth shadows and phantasies who lusted for power, and which he was powerless

103. adv. haer. I iv 1; H. i 31 - 33. Cf. Exc. ex Theod. 33.3.

104. Trac. Trip. 78.8 - 13.

105. Trac. Trip. 80.30 - 81.3; cf. De Res. 46.35 - 38; 48.13 - 16, 27f.

106. adv. haer. I iv 2; H. i 35. Cf. Trac. Trip. 98.1 - 5.

107. adv. haer. I iv 2; H. i 35.

to do anything about having been deprived of his All (80.13 - 24). His conversion or repentance was followed by remembrance of things which really exist (i.e. the Pleroma), and a prayer to the other Aeons and especially the Father (81.19 - 29). His prayer and remembrance become existent as the psychics and are superior to the hylics (called here 'those of the likeness', the psychics being called 'those of the remembrance').⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ There is an additional stage to the coming into existence of the hylic and psychic worlds when the Saviour comes to Sophia; to that we shall return.

Sophia's own request for help and the plea for help made by Christ on his entry to the Pleroma lead us to the next event. The Aeons join in the request for help and the Saviour is sent out to aid her.⁽¹⁰⁹⁾ The Saviour is accompanied by a host of angels, which had been emanated by the Aeons along with the Saviour as an army for him.⁽¹¹⁰⁾

108. The most comprehensive list of names for the psychics and hylics is given by the Tractatus Tripartitus. The psychics are also called, 'Those of the remembrance', 'those of the image', 'the Right', 'the fiery ones', and 'the midst'; the hylics are also called: 'Those of the likeness', 'the Left', 'darkness' and 'the last' (Trac. Trip. 98.14 - 20; cf. adv. haer. I vi 1; H. i 52; Exc. ex Theod. 34.1; 40).
109. Trac. Trip. 81.30 - 35; 86.12 - 33; 88.12 - 19. With the sending of the Saviour the account in the Excerpta ex Theodoto that is parallel to the account of Ptolemaeus in Irenaeus begins: adv. haer. I iv 5; H. i 38; Exc. ex Theod. 43.2ff.
110. Trac. Trip. 87.20 - 23; adv. haer. I ii 6; H. i 23.

The Saviour comes to Sophia as one whom the Father had endowed with all power, and under whose authority everything had been placed since he is 'the head of the whole after the Father'.⁽¹¹¹⁾ He had also been given everything by the Aeons so that 'in him all things might be created, things visible and invisible, thrones, divinities, dominions (Col. 1.16)'.⁽¹¹²⁾ The connection between Christ who abandoned Sophia and the Saviour who comes to her is emphasised first by the fact that Christ sent the Saviour from the Pleroma and then by the fact that Sophia when she saw the Saviour recognised that 'he is similar to the light who had deserted her'.⁽¹¹³⁾ Sophia (Achamoth in Ptolemaeus) received the Saviour and he brought about the formation according to knowledge⁽¹¹⁴⁾

111. Exc. ex Theod. 43.2.

112. adv. haer. I iv 5; H. i 38; cf. Exc. ex Theod. 43.2ff.

113. Exc. ex Theod. 44.1. Two things follow from this: the Saviour is Light and brings light to Achamoth; 'the light who had deserted her' is clearly Christ, but it is not certain whether Christ here is the Christ of Valentinus who originates from the Mother outside the Pleroma, or the Christ of Ptolemaeus who originates within the Pleroma, leaves the Pleroma to give Achamoth the formation according to substance and then deserts her when he returns to the Pleroma. See above, n. 66, and cf. Sagnard, Extraits, ad loc.

114. Since the Saviour is light (see the preceding note) the formation according to knowledge may equally be called illumination. Heracleon appears to refer to this double formation - according to substance and according to knowledge - in his exegesis of St. John's Gospel. In Heracleon there are two figures, both called the Son of Man, one who sows and one who reaps.

and so healed her sufferings. This he did by separating Sophia (or Achamoth) from the passion she experienced when deserted by Christ and from the substance that resulted from her conversion.⁽¹¹⁵⁾ The precise role of the Saviour in this differs slightly from one account to another: In Ptolemaeus the Saviour separates off Achamoth's sufferings, and since they could not be rendered invisible as in the case of the passion of the upper Sophia the Saviour mixed them and changed them into incorporeal matter. There were two substances: one bad from the passions, the other capable of suffering from the conversion. The significance of the Saviour's role here is brought out by the comment: 'In this way the Saviour practically effected a work of creation.'⁽¹¹⁶⁾ In other words the real agent in the work of creation that follows is the Saviour, and that in itself shows that the lower creation is part of the redemptive plan. The account in Theodotus is only slightly different

114. (contd.) Just as in Ptolemaeus it is the Saviour who comes with his angels, so in Heracleon the second Son of Man, the one who reaps, comes with his angels (Frag. 35). The Son of Man above the place ('Place' is Heracleon's term for the realm outside the Pleroma - Frag. 11; 13.3; 17.39; 35), then is the Christ of the Pleroma, the second Son of Man is the Saviour, and in all probability the Christ of the gospels was a third Son of Man (see Sagnard, La gnose val., pp. 488f.).
115. adv. haer. I iv 5; H. i 39f.; cf. Exc. ex Theod. 45.2.
116. adv. haer. I iv 5; H. i 41; cf. 'The Saviour becomes the first universal creator' (Exc. ex Theod. 47.1).

and the role of the Saviour is the same.⁽¹¹⁷⁾ In the Tractatus Tripartitus, however, the Saviour does not separate the passions from the logos, but made it possible for the logos 'to set apart from himself those who were disobedient to him.'⁽¹¹⁸⁾ The logos, then, retains a more dominant position here. To the destinies of these separated passions and conversion we shall shortly return, but we must first consider the further effect of the Saviour on Sophia.

Sophia or Achemoth, once freed from her passions, out of joy brought forth again, a spiritual birth in the likeness of the Saviour's attendant angels.⁽¹¹⁹⁾ These are the pneumatics. For our purpose what is important here is the relationship between these pneumatics, Sophia, Christ and the Saviour. The fullest development of this section of the drama is to be found in Theodotus, and we must go back a little to pick up the threads. When Christ abandoned his mother, Sophia, and ascended into the Pleroma, 'in him the seeds also were "filtered" with him as far as possible, entering with him into the Pleroma.'⁽¹²⁰⁾

117. The Mother emanates first the powers of the left, then the powers of the right with the Demiurge as their head, and when the Saviour comes he forms them, though not the powers of the left which are given to the Demiurge to form (Exc. ex Theod. 34.1; cf. 35.2; 40).

118. Trac. Trip. 88.23 - 25; cf. 90.16 - 19.

119. adv. haer. I iv 5; H. i 41; Trac. Trip. 90.31 - 91.1.

120. Exc. ex Theod. 41.2.

This entry of the seeds⁽¹²¹⁾ with Christ means that it can rightly be said that the Church was elected before the foundation of the world; indeed by this token the Gnostics can say, 'We have been included in the reckoning (i.e. in the *λόγος*) with him (*συνελογίσθημεν*) and manifested in the beginning.'⁽¹²²⁾ This pre-existence of the Gnostic Church receives some emphasis in the other Valentinian sources in the fact that Church is one of the Aeons of the Pleroma,⁽¹²³⁾ but in the Tractatus Tripartitus the Aeon, Church, has a particularly dominant position. It is said that 'not only does the Son exist from the beginning, but the Church also exists from the beginning.'⁽¹²⁴⁾ This Church is 'the Aeons of the Aeons',⁽¹²⁵⁾ and comes into existence from the mutual kisses of the Father and the Son.⁽¹²⁶⁾

To return to Theodotus: the seed that enters the Pleroma with Christ is in fact the body of the Saviour.⁽¹²⁷⁾ Behind this idea there is clearly the Pauline concept of the Church as the body of Christ. The relationship is

121. Probably the male element only, see below, n. 136.

122. Exc. ex Theod. 41.2. Cf. Trac. Trip. 88.20 - 23.

123. Cf. also Valentinus, Frag. 4, Hilg. 298 = Cl. Alex., Strom. IV 89.1 - 3; De Res. 46.27; 47.4 - 6; Ev. Ph. para. 57; Ev. Th. 19; 50; Ep. Iac. Apoc. 3.30 - 33. See also Zandee, art. cit., Numen 11(1964), pp. 43 - 45.

124. Trac. Trip. 57.33 - 35.

125. Trac. Trip. 58.32f.

126. Trac. Trip. 58.28 - 31; cf. Ev. Ph. para. 31.

127. Exc. ex Theod. 1.1.

even closer, however, for when Christ says: 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit', he in fact 'commends' Sophia, 'all the spiritual seed, the elect' to the Father. (128) Thus, Sophia is both the source of the spiritual seed and also its prototype, and these seeds are intimately related to her and to Christ and to the Saviour.

In its original form the spiritual seed was a unity. (129) In its present form it is male and female. The male elements are 'the election (ἡ ἐκλογὴ)', (130) 'the angelic elements'; (131) the female elements are 'the calling (ἡ κλησις)', (132) 'the superior seed', (133) 'the angelic elements of the Place and of the called'. (134) The male elements are concentrated with the Logos. (135) Precisely when the division of the seed into male and female took place is not clear, (136)

128. Exc. ex Theod. 1.2.

129. Exc. ex Theod. 36.1f; cf. Ev. Th. 4; 11; 16; 22; 23; 49; 75; 106.

130. Exc. ex Theod. 33.1.

131. Exc. ex Theod. 2.1f.

132. Exc. ex Theod. 21.1.

133. Exc. ex Theod. 35.1.

134. Exc. ex Theod. 39; 40. Cf. the system of Ptolemaeus, in which the elect are the pneumatics (the Gnostics themselves) and the called are the psychics (Exc. ex Theod. 58.1; cf. adv. haer. I viii 3; H. i. 72f.), see, e.g. Foerster, Gnosis I, p. 231.

135. Exc. ex Theod. 21.3.

136. Presumably this took place when Christ left Sophia and took with him the seeds into the Pleroma, but there are a number of inconsistencies in the accounts we have. Christ took the seeds into the Pleroma (Exc. ex Theod. 41.2) apparently leaving Sophia bereft of

but the male elements come with the Saviour as his angels out from the Pleroma to the female element.⁽¹³⁷⁾ The relationship between the two is evident in the description of the angels as 'angels of the superior seed'.⁽¹³⁸⁾ The male and female elements were once united and must be re-united (and therein lies the continuation of the drama). The importance of the Saviour is stressed by the fact that the female elements come into being as a result of the Saviour's action on Sophia, but this seed, being female and without form ($\chi\mu\omicron\rho\phi\omicron\varsigma$),⁽¹³⁹⁾ requires formation by the Saviour. The spiritual identity between these superior seeds and the Saviour, and therefore also the Pleroma, is emphasised by the fact that these seeds are not related to the passion of Sophia nor to creation, but are strictly 'children ($\tau\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\nu\alpha$)'; 'for that reason they are related to the Light (i.e. to the Saviour).'⁽¹⁴⁰⁾

136. (contd.) spiritual power (Exc. ex Theod. 33.3; cf. adv. haer. I iv 1; H. i 33; I xi 1; H. i 100f.; Trac. Trip. 78.11 - 13). The Saviour comes to Sophia bringing the male seeds and Sophia brings forth the female counterparts. The inconsistency does not obscure the central point that the Gnostic will eventually be united with his angelic counterpart.
137. Exc. ex Theod. 35. 1.
138. ibid.
139. Exc. ex Theod. 67.4.
140. Exc. ex Theod. 41.1f.

The close bond between the male and female elements is also emphasised by the fact that the female, superior seed is the effulgence (*ἀπορροία*) of the male, angelic element, that is, the female is derived from the male, (141) just as Eve was taken from Adam. (142) Furthermore, to achieve its final goal, the female element must become male, before entering the Pleroma in union with the angels. (143). The female by itself is in a state of death; it is the male elements who live, but, once raised, the female elements become 'equal to the angels' and 'restored to the male, members to members, in unity'. (144) So essential is this unity that without it even the male elements cannot by themselves enter the Pleroma. What is more, the entry into the Pleroma cannot take place until every male element is united with its female counterpart. (145) The final goal is the re-establishment of the One. (146)

In all of this a very clear foundation is laid for the remaining stage of the drama and its character as a salvation drama is beyond dispute. Both the nature of the system as salvation drama and the role of Christ are admirably expressed in a passage from the Gospel of Philip:

141. Exc. ex Theod. 2.1f.; 22.1; 35.3.

142. Exc. ex Theod. 21.2. The separation of Eve from Adam is prominent in the Gospel of Philip (para. 71; 79).

143. Exc. ex Theod. 21.3; cf. Ev.Th. 114; Ev. Mariae BG 17.19 - 22.

144. Exc. ex Theod. 22.2f.

145. Exc. ex Theod. 35.3f.

146. Exc. ex Theod. 36.2.

If the woman had not separated from the man, she would not die with the man. His separation became the beginning of death. Because of this Christ came, in order that he might remove the separation which was from the beginning, and again unite the two; and that he might give life to those who died in the separation, and unite them (para. 78).

None of our other Valentinian sources presents as elaborate an account of the origins of the spiritual seed (i.e. the essential spiritual core of the Gnostic himself) nor so clear a picture of the close relationship between Christ, the Saviour, Sophia and the Gnostics as does Theodotus, but the idea of the union of the Gnostic with his angelic counterpart is one that will have a dominant role in the sections on Redemption and the Consummation. (147)

In the Tractatus Tripartitus, although there is nothing comparable to the section in Theodotus on the spiritual seed, there are nevertheless references to the seed and especially in one difficult passage (96.24 - 38). It is said of the logos that 'the seeds that are to be he possesses within himself, through the promise which came to him whom he conceived as one belonging to the seeds that are to be' (95.24 - 28). Are these seeds the pneumatics? (148) The 'seed of promise' mentioned a little

147. Cf. adv. haer. I vii 1; H. i 59 (Ptolemaeus); Heracleon, Frag. 18.11 - 13, 20f.; 22; Exc. ex Theod. 21.3; 22.3; 35.3f.; 36; 68; 79 (Theodotus); adv. haer. I xiii 3; H. i 118 (Marcus); Trac. Trip. 95.6 - 9; Ev. Ph. para. 61; 71; 79; 103; 122; etc.

148. Elsewhere in the Tractatus Tripartitus the Aeons are said to have originated as seeds (60.27 - 61.11);

later (95.31f.) certainly are since 'they are sown by the coming of the Saviour and those with him' (95.34 - 36). If then 'the seeds that are to be' are also the pneumatics, who is the one conceived by the logos and belonging to the seeds? Of all that the logos could be said to have conceived (Christ, the hylics, the psychics and the pneumatics), Christ (i.e. the perfect Aeon who rose into the Pleroma) alone could be said to belong to the seeds. This itself, however, demands the importing of information from Theodotus, where Christ filtered the seeds into the Pleroma with himself. Then too, it is said that the logos 'brought forth his offspring, which was the manifestation of him whom he conceived' (95.29 - 31). If the one he conceived is Christ, then the offspring, his manifestation, could perhaps be the pneumatics again.⁽¹⁴⁹⁾ If indeed the seeds are the pneumatics, it is to be noted that there is no reference here to male and female nor to any eventual unity; they are simply seeds within the logos and sown by the coming of the Saviour.

There is also another section in the Tractatus Tripartitus in which the state of the pneumatics is described and the foundation laid for the next stage of

148. (contd.) the Gnostics themselves are sown in the Saviour (88.20 - 23); the pneumatics (?) were seeds before they received independent existence (91.31f.).
149. Cf. the statement in Theodotus that the pneumatics are quite strictly 'children' (τέκνα) of Sophia and the Saviour (Exc. ex Theod. 41.1f.). See above, p. 397.

the drama. The appearance of the Saviour to the logos had a different effect on each of the three emanations of the logos: the hylics from his passion; the psychics from his conversion; the pneumatics from the vision of the Saviour (91.25 - 31), and it is said of the Saviour that 'he did indeed appear to him (sc. the logos), but he was not yet mixed with him, in order that the things which came into being might not perish by looking at the light. For they will not be able to endure the great exalted stature' (92.17 - 22). There is, then, a union envisaged for the future, one toward which the drama moves. The effect of the Saviour on the logos is further described: 'he was a light, and he was a will to make him stand . . . and he was wisdom for his thinking . . . and a logos for speech . . .' (94.2 - 10). The passage continues: 'And it is these which took form with him according to the image of the Pleroma' (94.10 - 12). These are the pneumatics, for they bear the imprint of the forms of manhood, and do not have their origin in the sickness, which is female, but are from the logos after he had abandoned the sickness. In their harmony they resemble the Aeons (94.14 - 23). There is, however, a difference between them and the Saviour: he is the perfect image of the single light and he possesses his indivisibility (94.23 - 32); but they are not equal because the power is divided among them, even though in combination they possess the equality; each one must still shake off what is his (94.32 - 95.1). We then read: 'Because of this they are passions ($\pi\acute{\alpha}\theta\omicron\varsigma$)', they 'originate already from this one who has not yet received the Father' (95.2 - 6). Can this, with

its talk of passions, refer to the pneumatics, or is this the psychic and hylic that the pneumatic must shake off? Yet, are the psychic and hylic to receive the Father at all? There is in any case clear reference here to conditions that still remain to be put right, and this is confirmed in what follows: 'Hence the union with his All and the will is something useful for the dispensation (*οἰκονομία*) that was to come' (95.6 - 9). This is, perhaps, an oblique reference to the union of the Gnostic with his angelic counterpart. The next stage of the drama is prepared for in the statement that provision was made for them (the pneumatics?) to pass by the places below, even though the places can accept them only with difficulty and one by one. (150) The inter-relationship between Christ, Sophia (logos), the Saviour and the spiritual seed is not as developed here as in Theodotus, but the drama moves on clearly to the next stage.

We have already progressed beyond the confines of the Pleroma and have reached a convenient point at which to pause and sum up the role of Christ in the Pleroma and in the drama so far, before turning to consider the continuation of the drama in the work of the Demiurge and the creation of the lower world. In our Valentinian sources in which a relatively complete account is given of the emanation of the Aeons and the disturbance and establishment of the Pleroma (151) there can be no doubt that the

150. Trac. Trip. 95.9 - 16. Cf. 91.20 - 24.

151. I.e. in the systems of Ptolemaeus, Theodotus, Marcus, Valentinus and the Tractatus Tripartitus.

central role in emanation, revelation and redemption is taken by a Christ-like figure, be it Only-Begotten, Logos, Christ or Saviour. Furthermore, this must be understood in the light of the complex and subtle inter-relationships within the Pleroma, which are seen most clearly of all in the fact that the Saviour is the product of all the Aeons and embraces in himself the power of all the Aeons. The drama is a Christocentric drama, and though it begins as a revelation drama, the circumstances under which the revelation is to be made ensure that tragedy ensues, necessitating salvation. It now remains to be seen how the successive stages of this Christocentric salvation drama are worked out in Valentinian Gnosticism. (152)

II THE DEMIURGE AND THE LOWER WORLD

In the previous section, when the Saviour came to Sophia he divided off from her the results of her passion and conversion and formed them into incorporeal matter, comprising two substances - the hylie and the psychic. The joyful union of Sophia with the Saviour brought into existence the pneumatic seed. In the next stage of the drama, our interest lies not in the cosmogony itself but in the particular roles of the Saviour and Sophia. However, the main features of the cosmogony must be

152. The Christocentricity emerges with especial clarity when the Valentinian drama is compared with the Apocryphon of John.

considered so that the progression of the drama up to the coming of the Saviour can be seen.

In the system of Ptolemaeus it is said that Ahamoth wished to form the substances that had been produced and separated off from herself by the Saviour. She is unable to work with the pneumatic substance since it is *δμοούσιος* with herself.⁽¹⁾ She turned then to shaping the psychic nature which had come into existence from her conversion and projected the teachings of the Saviour.⁽²⁾ She formed the Demiurge,⁽³⁾ and he in turn brought forth the psychic Christ, the archangels and the angels.⁽⁴⁾ Once again the role of the Saviour is emphasised, for it is said that she did all this 'for the honour of the Aeons, and she made images of them - or rather the Saviour did so through her.'⁽⁵⁾ This also attests the fact that the lower world is itself part of the plan of salvation: it is precisely the Saviour who is the prime mover in its creation.

1. adv. haer. I v 1; H. i 42. 2. ibid.

3. According to Theodotus, when Christ ascended into the Pleroma, the Mother, distressed at his departure, brought forth 'the Ruler of the Economy' (Exc. ex Theod. 33.3), and according to Irenaeus's account of the system of Valentinus too the Mother emanated the Demiurge when deprived of Christ, and along with him emanated the Cosmocrator (adv. haer. I xi 1; H. i 100f.). This is closer to the Apocryphon of John where the malformed substance brought forth by Sophia is the Archon, Ialdabaoth.

4. Exc. ex Theod. 47.3.

5. adv. haer. I v 1;
H. i 42f.

There is a marked contrast between the role of the Saviour here and his role in the Tractatus Tripartitus. In the latter work it is never said that the logos is the Saviour's agent in the work of creation. It is of course the restored logos who begins the work of creation, but he appears to do this by his own authority. Indeed it is said that 'all those which were before and which are now and which are to be, the logos received the vision of them, because he has been entrusted with the dispensation (οἰκονομία) of all those who exist' (95.17 - 22). So the logos prepared the punishment for the disobedient (96.1ff.); he established the Demiurge as head of the psychics (96.17ff.); he made a 'paradise' for the pneumatics (96.26ff.); he established the place for the Church of the psychics, keeping them separate from the pneumatics (97.5 - 21).

It is not at all easy to decide which of these two forms was the earlier. Did Sophia originally work on her own, or was she at first thought of as the agent of the Saviour? Such evidence as there is suggests that the former is the case. In the first place, why should the author of the Tractatus Tripartitus remove a reference to the Saviour at this point? It would in fact provide a more direct connection between the sections of the drama.⁽⁶⁾ Secondly, in the system of Ptolemaeus the phrase 'or

6. The drama in any case is a coherent whole, but reference to the Saviour at this point would have strengthened the connection.

rather, the Saviour did it through her' could easily be interpreted as an insertion. Thirdly, in the Apocryphon of John, the Archon, Ialdabaoth, is produced by Sophia before she is restored, i.e. while Sophia is still in her fallen state. If therefore the Valentinian drama is derived from the Apocryphon of John at this point, the role of the Saviour both in healing Sophia and causing her to form the substances separated off from her must be a Valentinian interpretation. Finally, in Marcus it is said that the Demiurge 'by his own power and wisdom gives life to this world, the imitation of the seventh power'.⁽⁷⁾

Whether or not Sophia is the agent of the Saviour there is no doubt in our sources that Sophia herself controls the Demiurge and works through him in the fashioning of the universe. As the Tractatus Tripartitus expresses it: 'For the logos made use ($\chi\rho\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$) of him as a hand to adorn and work at the things below.'⁽⁸⁾ In Heracleon's exegesis of St. John's Gospel we have an even more explicit statement: 'it is the logos who presented to the Demiurge the cause of the origin of the world',

7. adv. haer. I xiv 7; H. i 141. Even so, the lower world is an imitation which suggests some connection between the Demiurge and the world of the Pleroma.
8. Trac. Trip. 100.30 - 33. Cf. Theophilus of Antioch, ad. Autol. II 18; Irenaeus, adv. haer. IV xx 1; H. ii 213; IV pf. 4; H. ii 145; V vi 1; H. ii 333; V xxviii 4; H. ii 403.

for, as Heracleon explains, the text of St John reads not $\alpha\phi' \sigma\upsilon$ or $\iota\phi' \sigma\upsilon$ but $\delta' \sigma\upsilon$, which clearly indicates that 'another made under his (sc. the Logos's) operation.' (9)

9. Heracleon, Frag. 1.23 - 26. Sagnard, working as he was with only the material from the Fathers concluded that the Logos here was the equivalent of the Saviour in the system of Ptolemaeus (La gnose val., pp. 481 - 83). In the light of the Tractatus Tripartitus this should perhaps be revised. Also, even in Ptolemaeus the Saviour does not manipulate the Demiurge directly, but only through Achamoth. However, the term 'logos' is used in a number of different ways both in the fragments of Heracleon and in the Tractatus Tripartitus. The same caution also applies in relation to other passages in Heracleon. Heracleon maintains that only 'he who is in the Aeon and those who came with him know whom they worship, and worship in truth.' Others adore the creator (sc. the Demiurge) and not the true creator, 'who is Christ, since "all things were made by him, and without him nothing was made".' (Heracleon, Frag. 22). Sagnard (La gnose val., p. 484) interprets this as equivalent to the creative role of the Logos in the Pleroma in the system of Ptolemaeus, on the ground that the reference to true worship means the worship in the Pleroma. Janssens, however (art. cit., Le Muséon 72 (1959), p. 137) sees this passage as parallel to the earlier statement that the logos (understood as the Saviour) controlled the Demiurge. We may also compare here Heracleon's exegesis of Jn 1.3 ('All things were made by him'): he excludes from the 'all' the Aeon and everything in the Aeon for they were 'before the Logos' (Heracleon, Frag. 1.2 - 7). 'All things' refers to the world and everything in it (Heracleon, Frag. 1.18f.). Certainly a much greater consistency is introduced to the fragments of Heracleon if his use of the term 'logos'

This same control of the Demiurge is made clear by Ptolemaeus⁽¹⁰⁾ and, indeed, by the Gospel of Philip.⁽¹¹⁾

The Demiurge is appointed by Sophia as Father and God of everything psychic and hylic and he fashions the incorporeal matter into corporeal matter.⁽¹²⁾ The hylic matter was left to the Demiurge to control and form because Sophia was unable to subdue it.⁽¹³⁾ When the Saviour was manifested to Sophia the hylic substance had been separated off and had become frightened and fell into the outer darkness, called Chaos, Amente and Nun.⁽¹⁴⁾ The hylics

9. (contd.) is understood in the light of the use of the term in the Tractatus Tripartitus. Whether one should on that account identify the author of the Tractatus Tripartitus as Heracleon is another much larger question that can only be answered after a thorough examination of the fragments of Heracleon and the Tractatus Tripartitus.

10. adv. haer. I v 1; H. i 42f.;

11. 'The archons thought that it was by their own power and will that they were doing what they did, but the Holy Spirit (= Sophia-Achamoth (?), cf. adv. haer. I iv 1; H. i 32f.) in secret was contriving everything through them as it wished.' (Ev. Ph., para. 16, cf. 34; 40).

See Janssens, art. cit., Le Muséon 81(1968), p. 93

12. adv. haer. I v 1; H. i 42f.; I v 2; H. i 45; Exc. ex Theod. 47.1 - 4; Trac. Trip. 99.4 - 7.

13. Exc. ex Theod. 34.1; Trac. Trip. 85.18 - 22.

14. Trac. Trip. 89.20 - 28.

are to rule the unspeakable darkness.⁽¹⁵⁾ Even so the hylics are not without purpose, for the Tractatus Tripartitus expressly states that this was their lot 'that they also should be useful for the dispensation (*οἰκονομία*) to come' (89.35f.). The whole arrangement of the lower world is planned by Sophia,⁽¹⁶⁾ but the work is carried out by the Demiurge, unaware that the plans are not his own. According to Ptolemaeus the Demiurge fashions the passions of Ahamoth into the material elements: from her fear he creates the irrational souls (i.e. the animals)⁽¹⁷⁾ from her grief he creates the Cosmocrator and the evil spirits, and from her terror he creates the corporeal elements of the world. All these elements are pervaded with fire.⁽¹⁸⁾ In the Tractatus Tripartitus, just as the Demiurge is controlled by the logos, so also the Cosmocrator is controlled by the Demiurge, and this too is described as something that the invisible

15. Trac. Trip. 89.31 - 33.

16. Trac. Trip. 99.4 - 100.1.

17. In the anthropology of Ptolemaeus 'soul' has two meanings: It is the breath of life that man shares with the remainder of the animal world, and it is the soul that is breathed into man by the Demiurge making him of the same nature as the Demiurge. See Sagnard, La gnose val., p. 528 and Foerster, art. cit., p. 26, and cf. Exc ex Theod. 50.1.

18. adv. haer. I v 4; H. i 46 - 49; Exc. ex Theod. 48.1 - 4; 7.5; 22.2, 7; cf. 80.1; Trac. Trip. 103.13 - 104.3 (Here the lower world is divided into three levels: those whom the logos brought forth in phantasy; those whom these brought forth out of lust for power; and those who came from envy and jealousy).

spirit⁽¹⁹⁾ did through the Demiurge 'to accomplish the dispensation (οἰκονομεῖν)'.⁽²⁰⁾ The Tractatus Tripartitus adds a further point: that the psychics and hylics were at war with one another, and indeed therein lies the clue to the inability of the logos to work with the hylic material himself; the violence of the hylics, and his own hope and expectation led the logos to separate himself from the hylics and, eventually, appoint the Demiurge over them (84.6 - 85.22).

Not only is there a thread of control running from the top to bottom of the established order of things, but between the world of the Pleroma and the sphere of the psychics there is a closer bond, for the Demiurge not only follows out the instructions of Sophia, but constructs the lower world as an imitation of the Pleroma. So the Demiurge himself is in the image of Only-Begotten, and the angels and archangels of the Demiurge are in the image of the Aeons.⁽²¹⁾ The author of the Tractatus Tripartitus

19. The role of the invisible spirit here is that elsewhere ascribed to the logos (see above, pp.405f.). Is there an echo here of Sophia's being called the Holy Spirit in the system of Ptolemaeus (adv. haer. I iv 1; H. i 32f.)? Elsewhere in the Tractatus Tripartitus the spirit is given to the Aeons to help them know the Father (Trac. Trip. 72.2, 18). Cf. also the Apocryphon of John and The Gospel of the Egyptians.

20. Trac. Trip. 102.32 - 103.6. Here however the reference is probably not to any divine plan of redemption but simply to the arrangement of the lower world.

21. adv. haer. I v 1; H. i 43; Exc. ex Theod. 7.5; 33.3; adv. haer. I xiv 7; H. i 142; I xiv 2; H. i 132; I xiv 6; H. i 137.

goes even further and maintains that the Demiurge is in the image of the Father of all and hence bears the appropriate names: father, god, worker, king, judge, place, dwelling and law (100.22 - 30). Furthermore, the Demiurge provided for the psychics a paradise similar to the paradise provided for the pneumatics by the logos (101.29 - 35).

The idea that the lower world is a copy of the Pleroma is found in the Apocryphon of John,⁽²²⁾ and a fragment from Valentinus himself shows that it was part of his cosmology: 'The world is as much inferior to the living Aeon as the image is to the living person. What, then, is the cause of the image? It is the greatness of the person who provides the example for the painter, so that it may be honoured by his (sc. the person's) name. For even though the form is not found in its authenticity, the name supplies what is lacking in the making (of the model). The invisible power of God assists for faith in what is fashioned.'⁽²³⁾ This is somewhat enigmatic until read in the light of the developed Valentinian systems. The lower world is a copy of the Pleroma, but to him who knows the Name a kind of natural theology is possible in that the Name makes good the deficiencies in the copy. Provided you know the Name the visible creation can point

22. See above, p.336.

23. Valentinus, Frag. 5 (Hilg. 299 = Clement of Alex. Strom. IV 89.6 - 90.4).

to the genuine article, the living Aeon, of which the creation is merely a copy. The key lies in knowing the Name. In Theodotus, Only-Begotten is the Name, and from him comes the Pleroma, and Sophia produced a shadow of the Name. (24) Valentinus himself speaks of Adam's being made in the Name of Man (the heavenly Anthropos). (25) Revelation of the Name, then, (a revelation accessible only to the Gnostic) is the key to knowing the Aeon. (26) Revealed knowledge is the means by which the Gnostic becomes aware of his part in the drama, and indeed the means by which the drama itself advances, as we shall see in the section on redemption. In the Gospel of Philip too this same contrast is drawn: the lower world is merely an image of the true world above. (27)

Before we go on to consider the creation of man and the place of the different classes of men in the drama, we must return to the Gospel of Truth. Earlier we noted that the drama in the Gospel of Truth moves on two different levels at once: there is a movement that takes place within the Father, and a movement that takes place away from and towards the Father. We must now say something

24. Exc. ex Theod. 31.3f.

25. Valentinus, Frag. 1 (Hilg. 293 = Clement of Alex. Strom. II 36.2 - 4).

26. Cf. the Gospel of Truth; see above, pp. 359ff.

27. Ev. Ph. para. 67; 72; 124; 127; cf. 11; cf. also Ev. Th. 83.

more about the 'external' drama. A clear process of external movement seems to be implied in the origin of Inability to know, ⁽²⁸⁾ Error, Oblivion and Deficiency, but, as with the All etc., the movement is a complicated one that sometimes entails an obvious movement, and at other times suggests a movement more in thought, so to speak. ⁽²⁹⁾ 'Inability to know the Father produced anguish and terror, and the anguish became dense like a mist so that no-one could see. Therefore Error became strong; it worked at its matter in emptiness, without knowing the truth; it became a creature, preparing in beauty as best she could the substitute of the truth.' ⁽³⁰⁾ Thus Error causes something concrete to come into existence, and once again we notice that it is a copy of the truth. It is also said that 'Oblivion did not come into existence beside the Father, though it came into existence because of him' (17. 31 - 18.3). Thus Error and Oblivion both appear to bring

28. The meaning of the Coptic *byē* is best conveyed by the German Erkenntnisunfähigkeit: that is, it is not simply a matter of ignorance, of not knowing, or having forgotten, it is an inability to know. Till consistently renders *byē* as Erkenntnisunfähigkeit (ZNTW 50(1959), pp. 165 - 85).

29. R. Haardt has attempted to reconstruct the outline of a Plane - myth in the Gospel of Truth. R. Haardt, 'Zur Struktur des Plane-Mythos im Evangelium Veritatis des Codex Jung', in Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 58(1962), pp. 24 - 38. See also J.E. Ménard, 'La *πλάνη* dans l'Évangile de Vérité', in SMR 7(1964), pp. 3 - 36.

30. Ev. Ver. 17.9 - 21. Cf. Valentinus, Frag. 5, but cf. Arai, op. cit., pp. 55f. who rejects the comparison.

about a form of existence over against the Father and his Aeons and Spaces etc. The existence of Oblivion is clearly linked to the fact that the All cannot know the Father in whom they are. 'He whose name is not called cannot know' and 'he who remains unable to know to the end is a creature of Oblivion and will be destroyed with it' (21.30 - 37). Again the reference to a creature suggests something that comes into existence as a result of being unable to know the Father.⁽³¹⁾ The Father gives repose to the Aeons, and repose is this: 'having filled deficiency he abolished form (σχῆμα). Its (sc. Deficiency's) form is the world (κόσμος), which is enslaved to it (sc. the form).⁽³²⁾ Just as Oblivion is the result of being unable to know the Father, so too is Deficiency (24.28 - 30). Just as Error worked with matter, so Deficiency is associated with

31. Grobel (op. cit., n. 145) considers that one may choose to remain ignorant to the end; hence he argues that the predestination of the work 'is not static or mechanical'. On the contrary, the work is rigidly governed by predestination. The determining factor is the call; If the Father does not call you, you will remain unable to know. Those who are still unable to know at the end demonstrate by that fact not that they have remained obdurate, but that they have not been called and must therefore be creatures of Oblivion.

32. Ev. Ver. 24.20 - 24. The translation given is that adopted by the editio princeps, but it is by no means assured. The problem concerns the pronouns. Cf. the following: 'Sein Kleid is die Welt, in der er (= der Sohn?) dient' (Till); 'La forme en est le monde, à qui celui-ci était asservi' (Ménard); 'Its scheme is the world in which he had been a servant' or 'The scheme of it (the Lack) is the world in which it (the Lack?)

matter. (33)

To this extent then, Error, Inability to know, Oblivion and Deficiency are hypostasised, and their several activities bring into existence a world over against the Father and his All and the Spaces in him. At the same time, however, these things characterise the Aeons and Spaces prior to the revelation of the Father to them. (34) Error is without root (17.29f.), and so insubstantial are its products that the Anguish, Oblivion and creatures are described as nothing (17.23 - 25), and Oblivion and Deficiency, which both come into existence through inability to know the Father, disappear once the Father is known. (35) Error itself becomes empty at the approach

32. (contd.) or he (Jesus?) was a slave (or servant)' (Grobel); 'the form of it (i.e. what was incomplete) is the world, that which it served' (Isenberg); 'The shape (of the Lack) is the World in which He had been enslaved' (Haardt); 'His form is the world, that wherein he served' (Wilson, NTA I, 526). See further Grobel, op. cit., n. 219.

33. Ev. Ver. 35.9; cf. De Res. 46.36 - 38.

34. Jonas (Gnomon 32(1960), p. 332) sees in this an indication of a division into an upper Ignorance, a lower Ignorance, and (in Ev. Ver. 18.17f.) a lowest Ignorance. In fact this is perhaps to try to be too systematic, suggesting divisions in the stages of the drama akin to the divisions in the system of Ptolemaeus. In fact there seems rather to be one drama in the Gospel of Truth, but a drama that operates on several different levels at once. See below, n. 55.

35. Ev. Ver. 18.7 - 11; 24.28 - 32. Cf. adv. haer. I xxi

of knowledge (26.23 - 27). More important is the fact that Error and Deficiency do not simply exist over against the All, but describe the state of the All before the revelation is made. This is seen most clearly in respect of Deficiency. 'He who cannot know is deficient, and it is a great thing that he lacks, since he lacks that which will perfect him. Since the perfection of the All is in the Father and it is necessary for the All to return to him and each one take possession of what is his own, he wrote them down in advance, having prepared them that he might give it (sc. the perfection) to those who came from him.'⁽³⁶⁾ The complexity of the movement again becomes apparent here in that the All are deficient, but the making good of the deficiency, the granting of what is essentially theirs, involves a return to the Father. Deficiency characterises, therefore, not only the state of the All, but the condition of the external world that Error brought into being. The cosmological drama of our other Valentinian sources seems rather removed from the Gospel of Truth at this point,⁽³⁷⁾ but, in fact, the primary tension that provides the moving force of the drama is the same in both cases. In the Gospel of Truth inability to know the Father leads to separation from the Father be it separation through being

35. (contd.) 4; H. 1 186. See below, pp. 529ff. on the relation of the drama in the Gospel of Truth to the drama in the other Valentinian sources.

36. Ev. Ver. 21.14 - 25. Cf. Valentinus, Frag. 5.

37. See below, pp.

oblivious or deficient, or separation through having fallen from the Father into the material universe. In our other Valentinian sources we noted at the outset⁽³⁸⁾ that the drama began with the tension between the ineffable Father and the revelation of him.

We return now to the drama in our other Valentinian sources. When the Demiurge finished ordering the universe from top to bottom, under the invisible direction of Sophia,⁽³⁹⁾ he eventually created man in the fourth heaven,⁽⁴⁰⁾ making him first from the dust (*χοϊκός*), an invisible substance, not dust of the earth, and then making him psychic by breathing into him the psychic man. Finally the Demiurge encased this man in flesh.⁽⁴¹⁾ In his hylic element with its animal soul, man possessed the image (*εἰκόν*) of the Demiurge and in the psychic element, the likeness (*ὁμοίωσις*).⁽⁴²⁾ Once again we see the parallelism between the stages of the drama.⁽⁴³⁾ Since the

38. See above pp. 353ff.

39. Trac. Trip. 100.9 - 12.

40. Exc. ex Theod. 51.1.

41. adv. haer. I v 5; H. i 50; cf. with much more detail Exc. ex Theod. 50 - 57. Cf. Trac. Trip. 106.18 - 108.8 (Zandee, in Numen 11(1964), pp. 33f.).

42. adv. haer. I v 5; H. i 49.

43. In the Apocryphon of John Ialdabaoth makes man according to the image of the Father which the Father revealed in the water. See above p. 337.

Demiurge is psychic and knows nothing of the pneumatic, he is unaware that Sophia (Achamoth) transmitted to him some of the pneumatic seed which he has now unwittingly sown in man, in his soul and in his material body.⁽⁴⁴⁾

The fact that the pneumatic is literally encased in the psychic and hylic can be illustrated clearly from Heracleon's understanding of John the Baptist. John the Baptist is both pneumatic and psychic, for John is a prophet and more than a prophet (Mt. 11.9 - 11). 'Prophet' refers to the external John (= psychic) which is simply the garment of the real John within (= pneumatic).⁽⁴⁵⁾ As a prophet he can be so called by the Saviour, and also Elijah, but as more than a prophet John can truthfully deny both titles. The real John is the pneumatic enveloped by the psychic. As a psychic John represents the Demiurge⁽⁴⁶⁾ and describes the Saviour as the Lamb of God.⁽⁴⁷⁾ As more

44. adv. haer. I v 6; H. i 51; In the Apocryphon of John Ialdabaoth is unaware that he possesses some of the spiritual seed but is persuaded by Self-Born and his four lights to breath into the face of the inert man, thus transmitting to the man some of the spiritual power, making man superior to the archons (see above, pp.337f.). Cf. also Valentinus, Frag. 1, where the angels are terror-struck by the man they have made, because the pre-existent Man was established in him.
45. Heracleon, Frag. 5.37 - 44, 52 - 54.
46. Heracleon, Frag. 8. 34 - 38.
47. Heracleon, Frag. 10.

than a prophet John is the voice of the Logos⁽⁴⁸⁾ and declares that the Saviour takes away the sin of the world.⁽⁴⁹⁾

The spiritual seed or spiritual man that has been sown is also called Church.⁽⁵⁰⁾ Thus the syzygy, Man-Church, in the Pleroma is mirrored in the spiritual man and the church of the Valentinians - the élite, chosen men.⁽⁵¹⁾ This spiritual seed is not simply *πνεῦμα* from Sophia (Achamoth), but from Sophia formed according to substance by Christ and according to knowledge by the Saviour; it has therefore a unique relationship with the Pleroma. This spiritual seed sown in man is formed only according to substance and must therefore go through a process of development to be able to receive the perfect Logos.⁽⁵²⁾ This lays the foundation for the next stage of the drama, the descent of the Saviour.

Compared with this relatively simple situation in which the spiritual seed needs formation according to knowledge, the Gospel of Truth presents a more complex picture of the situation prior to the coming of the Saviour. We have spoken of the internal and external drama in the Gospel of Truth, but this idea must be taken further still, for the Gnostic saw in the events recorded in the Gospel of Truth a paradigm of his own

48. Heraclion, Frag. 5.1 - 8, 27.

49. Heraclion, Frag. 10.

50. adv. haer. I v 6; H. i 51.

51. The law of 'exemplarisme' again. See Sagnard, La gnose val., pp. 244 - 49.

52. adv. haer. I v 6; H. i 50f.; cf. II xix 1 - 6; H. i 316 - 20.

situation: the perilous predicament in which he was prior to receiving the saving knowledge and the joy consequent on his being saved. So, in the All he sees a cosmological representation of his own salvation drama.⁽⁵³⁾ In both the internal and external drama the essential condition of the All (or the Gnostic) prior to redemption is deficiency, and so the drama on both its levels moves towards the filling of the deficiency.

As an illustration of this we may consider the 'parable' of the physician in the Gospel of Truth: 'For the physician hastens to the place where there is a sick (man), for that is the desire that is in him. He who suffers lack hides it not, for he (the physician) has what he (the sick man) needs. Thus the Pleroma, which does not lack, fills up the deficiency, (the Pleroma) which he (the Father) gave of himself to fill up what he needs, in order that he might receive grace; for at the time when he was deficient he did not possess grace. For this reason there was an inferiority in the place where grace was not. As soon as this little thing was received, which he lacked, He (the Father) revealed him as a Pleroma, which is the finding of the light of the truth,

53. In fact the real centre of the Gnostic systems and mythology is man, and the cosmology is merely part of the answer to the classic questions expressed in Exc. ex Theod. 78.2. See esp. Sagnard, La gnose val., pp. 570 - 74.

which shone upon him, for it is unchangeable' (35.30 - 36.13). There is no suggestion so far of any external movement, but immediately after this the return to the Father is explicitly mentioned: 'A feeble thing it is, a thing that easily lifts itself erect when it discovers him who is come to that which he will lead back (home). For this return is called conversion ($\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\iota\varsigma$). (54) For this reason imperishability breathed forth. It followed after him who had sinned, that he might find rest' (35.18 - 27). The juxtaposition of the two ideas, the return as a journey back home, and the supplying of something that is lacking, attests the complexity of the concept of salvation in the Gospel of Truth. The connection between the two ideas is very close however, precisely because the return is a journey home; the All returns to the Father to take possession of what is its own (21.19 - 23). The salvation drama takes place on two levels at once. It is something internal - a discovery of one's true self through the making good of the deficiency, and it is something external - a journey back to the Father from whom one began and in whom alone perfection is to be found, having been led out of the place of Deficiency and the matter devised by Error. (55)

54. For the use of $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\iota\varsigma$ in the sense of conversion rather than repentance cf. Clement of Alex. paed. I.VI 32.1 (on the Valentinians) and ApocryJn II 9.18 - 22; BG 36.8 - 12. See editio princeps (Suppl.), p. 17.
55. On the intimate relationship between the state of ignorance, be it on the divine or the human level, and

It will be useful to sum up the outline of the salvation drama in the Gospel of Truth on both the internal and external level. The ultimate purpose of the Father is that the spiritual beings who originate from him should know him. Although they are in him they cannot know him. This knowledge can come only by revelation, but since the knowledge is not communicated at first a fall results. On the internal level, the spiritual beings are unable to know, asleep, drunken, deficient;⁽⁵⁶⁾ their perfection is retained by the Father, so that, for redemption, they must turn to the Father; they indeed need the Father. Since, however, it is their own perfection that the Father retains, the revelation is in effect self-knowledge. Hence, 'if anyone has knowledge, he receives what is his own and draws it to himself' (21.11 - 14); 'he knows, as one who, having been drunk, turned away from his drunkenness, and, returning to himself, reaffirmed what is his

55. (contd.) the external existence of the products of ignorance, see Jonas, in Studia Patristica VI (Berlin, 1962; = TU 81), pp. 109ff. 'In this way matter appears to be a function rather than a substance of its own, a state or "affection" of the absolute being, and the solidified external expression of that state. Its stable externality is in truth nothing but the residual by-product of a deteriorating movement of inwardness, representing and as it were fixating the lowest reach of its defection from itself.' Cf. also Arai, op. cit., pp. 21 - 24.

56. Cf. the long 'nightmare', Ev. Ver. 28.28 - 30.12. See also, Zandee, art. cit., Numen 11(1964), pp. 34 - 41; Jonas, The Gnostic Religion, ch. 3.

own' (22.16 - 20). In the unity that replaces the form of Deficiency 'each one finds himself' (25.10 - 12). In the external drama, inability to know the Father produces the hypostasis Error and its derivatives, Oblivion and Deficiency, and the material world. The spiritual being is in this lower world. Its descent is not described, (57) but redemption in this context is a return journey, a re-ascension to the Father, and a taking possession of one's own essential self. In both cases the crucial point, the awakening out of sleep or the beginning of the return journey, the *μετάνοια*, is brought about by a revelation of knowledge. This revelation is made by Christ, and to that we shall return in the next section. (58)

In the salvation drama not only the pneumatics are involved; the psychics and hylics have their part to play

57. But this is to be expected for the Gospel of Truth is not primarily a mythological account of the salvation drama.

58. As Quispel notes: 'Unser Buch ist also ein Ruf zur Selbstbesinnung, zur "Bekehrung" zu sich selbst und zu Gott, ein Aufdeckung und Enthüllung des eigentlichen Selbst und zugleich Gnosis von Gott, in dem unser wahres Wesen seinen Ursprung und sein Ende findet. Diese Selbstentdeckung und Seinsenthüllung vollzieht sich durch die Offenbarung des göttlichen Wortes, welches von Christus vermittelt wird, und bedeutet reelle, erfahrene Erlösung' ('Neue Funde zur valentinianischen Gnosis. Der Codex Jung', in ZRGG 6(1954), p. 297).

as well. (59) On the hylics we can be very brief. Despite the references in the Tractatus Tripartitus to the fact that the hylics are useful for the *οἰκονομία* to come, they are destined to perish. (60) They are mere shadows, images and phantasies and their end will be as their beginning, they shall return to that which does not exist. (61) They have, then, no part in salvation.

The psychics on the other hand are more fortunate. Here, however, two distinct attitudes can be distinguished in Valentinianism: some regarded the psychics with some sympathy, others looked on them as little better than the hylics. These attitudes can be observed in relation both to the psychics in general and to their leader the Demiurge. In the Apocryphon of John, of course, the equivalent of the Valentinian Demiurge, the Archon, Ialdabaoth, is the principal opponent of the forces of the world of light. So too, Valentinus himself appears to have regarded the Demiurge in an unfavourable light, for when the Demiurge created man and man surpassed the Demiurge because of his likeness to the pre-existent man, the reaction of the Demiurge and his angels was to hide (or even destroy -

59. The division into three races, pneumatic, psychic and hylic, is constant in Valentinianism. Foerster argued (*op. cit.*, p. 57) that in theme B (Hippolytus) there was only one race of men, but Sagnard has demonstrated (La gnose val., pp. 234 - 36) that even here three races are envisaged.

60. adv. haer. I vii 5; H. i 64f.; Exc. ex Theod. 3.2; 56.2; Heracleon, Frag. 46.23f.

61. Trac. Trip. 78.28 - 79.4.

ἡφάνισαν) the work.⁽⁶²⁾ So too in Theodotus the Demiurge appears to be a hostile figure: the Saviour sits beside him, subduing him and allowing the seeds to pass on upwards to the Pleroma,⁽⁶³⁾ and the Saviour rescues the pneumatics from the battle between the angels and the powers of the Demiurge.⁽⁶⁴⁾ Furthermore, the psychics as a whole have little importance in Theodotus. Whereas in Ptolemaeus the Church of the chosen and the called means the Church of pneumatics and psychics,⁽⁶⁵⁾ in Theodotus the chosen and the called are both pneumatic.⁽⁶⁶⁾ In the Gospel of Philip too the archons appear hostile.⁽⁶⁷⁾

On the other hand, Ptolemaeus, Heracleon and the author of the Tractatus Tripartitus seem to have regarded the psychics and the Demiurge with a more sympathetic eye. Heracleon's comments relate to redemption and we shall consider the matter more fully in a later section; suffice it to say here that the psychics are saved at the psychic level even if they do not enter the Pleroma.⁽⁶⁸⁾

62. Valentinus, Frag. 1.

63. Exc. ex Theod. 38.3.

64. Exc. ex Theod. 69 - 75; esp. 72.1; 74.1f.; cf. 25.2.

65. Exc. ex Theod. 58.1; cf. adv. haer. I viii 3; H. i 72f.

66. Exc. ex Theod. 21.1; 33.1.

67. Ev. Ph., para. 9; 13; 14.

68. See below, pp. 511f.

The author of the Tractatus Tripartitus also has a high opinion of the psychics, of whom the Demiurge is head. In the first place the psychics originate from the fallen logos's prayer for help,⁽⁶⁹⁾ and this already prepares us for the description of them as 'good'.⁽⁷⁰⁾ Indeed, they are described as 'beings of light' and, unlike the hylics, saw sweet dreams (82.33 - 37). Even though they can never know the Father, the logos gave the psychics the intention of seeking for the Father, of searching for one greater than themselves (83.18 - 26). When the Saviour came to the logos, the psychics possessed the seed of wonder at his revelation; they welcomed him, worshipped him and acknowledged the light (89.12 - 20). They brought forth agreement and love; they acted in unity and were victorious over the lust to control that characterised the hylics.⁽⁷¹⁾ They are, of course, above the hylics even if below the logos and the pneumatics.⁽⁷²⁾ Even though they are given a somewhat lowly position outside the Pleroma, they continue to preserve the likeness of the Pleroma, especially in the names they bear (97.27 - 32). They are, however, subjected for a while to the hylics. But that has a redemptive purpose, for it prevents them from becoming boastful, and, by going through a kind of purgatory, they learn to seek the one who can heal them (98.27 - 99.4).

69. Trac. Trip. 82.10 - 12; 83.14 - 17; 87.26 - 30.

70. Trac. Trip. 82.15; cf. 83.10f.

71. Trac. Trip. 83.26f., 29f., 34f.; 84.28 - 31; 87.24 - 26.

72. Trac. Trip. 83.7 - 9; 83.36 - 84.1; 87.16 - 21.

Further light is shed on the function of the psychics in the salvation drama by the account of the system of Ptolemaeus. The pneumatic seed was sent forth as the light and salt of the world, and was linked with the psychic 'for the psychic too needs education through perception (αἰσθητῶν παιδευμάτων)',⁽⁷³⁾ The meaning of this is that both pneumatic and psychic receive education appropriate to their respective orders.⁽⁷⁴⁾ It is because of the union of the pneumatic and psychic that the world was established and that the Saviour came to save the psychic as well as the pneumatic.⁽⁷⁵⁾ The distinction between the two groups to be saved, the pneumatics and the psychics, is expressed in the following: Christ 'takes up, by his own power, the Church, the chosen and the called (τὸ ἐκλεκτὸν καὶ τὸ κλητόν), the one pneumatic from her who gave birth, the other psychic from the dispensation . . . and through these those who are of the same substance as they.'⁽⁷⁶⁾

73. adv. haer. I vi 1; H. i 52.

74. Although in some other context it would be possible to understand the previous sentence as a statement that both pneumatics and psychics require education through perception (i.e. a psychic education), in the context of Gnosticism this is quite out of the question; 'Il est impossible de dire, en termes de gnose, que le "pneumatique" "a besoin d'une éducation psychique".' (Sagnard, La gnose val., p.398).

75. adv. haer. I vii 5; H. i 64f.; Exc. ex Theod. 56.2.

76. Exc. ex Theod. 58.1; cf. adv. haer. I viii 3; H. i 72f.

The Church then is both psychic and pneumatic. (77) To these we shall return in discussing the redemption and the consummation.

Even more important here is the light shed by Ptolemaeus on the role of the Demiurge in the drama, and in particular his role in the Old Testament. Ptolemaeus by no means rejected the Old Testament, (78) and the

77. On the structure of the Church cf. Müller, art. cit., pp. 200 - 04.

78. Ptolemaeus in his Letter to Flora (Epiphanius, Pan. 33.3.2 - 6. Further references to the Letter to Flora are to the section and subsection of Pan. 33) carefully distinguishes his own position from that of the Catholic Church on the one hand and from Marcion on the other: 'These on the one hand say that this Law was given by God the Father himself, but the others taking the opposite path, assert that it was given by the adversary, the Devil who deals corruption' (3.2). The former are wrong because the Law is imperfect and contains commandments that are at variance with the nature of God the Father (3.4); the latter are wrong since the Law is clearly directed against injustice (3.5). As we shall see below, the answer of Irenaeus to the first point is that the Old Testament, including the Law, is God's preparation in history for the event of the Incarnation, and adapted to suit man's capabilities; it does not reflect on the imperfection of the nature of the God who gave the Law. This should not be taken as an indication that Irenaeus knew of Ptolemaeus's precise attitude to the Law and was replying to it. For the most part Irenaeus characterises the approach of his opponents as a complete antithesis between Law and Gospel (see Houssiau, op. cit., p. 48). Ptolemaeus's

Demiurge himself has a positive part to play in the salvation drama. The souls that possessed the seed from Sophia, that is, the spiritual seed, are most loved by the Demiurge since he thinks that they are like himself, and 'he appointed them as prophets, priests and kings. And many things were spoken by this seed through the prophets since they were of a higher nature. The Mother said much about the higher things, but did so both through this one (sc. the Demiurge) and the souls made by him. Furthermore, they (Irenaeus means the Valentinians) divide up the prophecies, claiming that one is spoken by the Mother, another by the seed and another by the Demiurge.'⁽⁷⁹⁾ There is no suggestion here of a total rejection of the Old Testament as there is, for example, in the corresponding account in Hippolytus.⁽⁸⁰⁾ Rather, Ptolemaeus has succeeded in integrating the Old Testament into the salvation drama. He has done so, not in any sense of a historical preparation for the New Testament, that is, not as salvation history, but simply as evidence for the fact that even in the Old Testament there were signs of the spiritual truth. The salvation drama itself does not demand any such assessment of the Old Testament, there is no reason in the Gnostic understanding of revelation why there should be any significant evidence

78. (contd.) characterisation of the attitude of Marcion to the Law is less than accurate. Marcion acknowledged that the Law was just, but he rejected its justice (see Quispel, Ptolémée, pp. 10f.)

79. adv. haer. I vii 3; H. i 62f.; cf. Trac. Trip. 100.33

of the spirit's presence prior to the coming of the Saviour and his awakening of the seed.

The attitude of Ptolemaeus to the Old Testament is even more clearly expressed in his Letter to Flora. There Ptolemaeus maintains that the Law is not homogeneous since it contains parts that stem from God, parts from Moses and parts from the Elders. But even that part of the Law that comes from God is subject to a further division into three parts. The God of the Law is the Demiurge. He is neither 'good in his own nature' as is the perfect God, nor 'evil and wicked and characterised by injustice' as is the Cosmocrator, the devil; he is 'just, since he is the arbiter of the justice that depends on him' (7.5). Justice in this case is not by any means the equivalent of goodness. As regards the Law, there is 'the pure legislation' represented by the Decalogue (5.3), 'which the Saviour came not to destroy but to fulfil (Mt. 5.17), for what he fulfilled was not foreign to him, but it needed fulfilment for it did not have perfection' (5.1). It corresponds, then, to the spiritual seed, which the Demiurge unwittingly sowed in man, and which requires to be formed according to knowledge to attain perfection.⁽⁸¹⁾

80. Ref. VI 35.1.

81. This appears to be the only reasonable way in which to explain the fact that the Decalogue, the pure law, both comes from the Demiurge and yet is not alien to the Saviour. See Quispel, Ptolémée, pp. 24 - 30.

Then there are unjust laws which the Saviour abolished 'even though he acknowledged that they came from God' (5.7). These laws are exemplified by the lex talionis (5.4 - 6). The laws are not in themselves unjust and they are designed to avoid transgression of the pure law, nevertheless they lead to injustice, 'for the second person to do something unjust does nothing less unjust (than the first person), he differs only in the order in which he does it, the deed remains the same' (5.4). The third part of the Law from God is the cultic law. This is 'in the image of the spiritual and transcendent realities' (6.4). Once the truth appears the meaning changes; the exterior form is abolished and the spiritual sense is deepened; the old terms have a new content (5.9). Ptolemaeus does not deny the importance of the old, indeed he goes so far as to say that 'the images and symbols, which are representations of other realities, are appropriate until the truth is present' (6.5). In practice, the alteration of the cultic law means the spiritual application of the earlier rite. Thus the old animal sacrifices are replaced by 'praise, glory, thanks-giving, fellowship with one's neighbour, and good works for him' (5.10).

What is to be noted in all this is that first of all the Demiurge occupies a place between the perfect God and the Cosmocrator, and the Law which he delivers falls into three divisions akin to the division of substances and men into pneumatic, psychic and hylic. In the case of

the Law, one division is perfected, one is destroyed and one is transmuted, which betokens a favourable attitude to two of the three divisions, and, presumably, a favourable attitude to the psychics as well as the pneumatics. It is also to be observed that Ptolemaeus finds an answer to the problem of the relation of the Old Testament to the New Testament that has many similarities with those who opposed him, especially with regard to the Law's need of fulfilment.⁽⁸²⁾ What differentiates Ptolemaeus's account from that of his opponents is not the detail of the spiritual fulfilment of the law,⁽⁸³⁾ or even the abolition of some points of the law, but the context in which the Law is set.⁽⁸⁴⁾ The positive value

82. Cf. 'Among the Valentinians, Ptolemy was the first to go beyond the complete rejection of the Old Testament, a position held by the founder himself as well as by Heracleon, and which surely also characterised Marcus' (W. Bauer, op. cit., pp. 197f.). Bauer cites no evidence in the case of Heracleon and Marcus, and in view of Heracleon's favourable attitude to the psychics Bauer's judgement may be incorrect here.

83. Cf. esp. Melito's Paschal Homily. See above, pp. 286ff.

84. Cf. 'Chaque remarque de Ptolémée - ou peu s'en faut - peut être mise en parallèle avec un passage correspondant de la littérature chrétienne de son temps, mais que le choix et la disposition des arguments sont inspirés par un schème herméneutique qui est dérivé d'une doctrine esotérique' (Quispel, Ptolémée, p. 8).

that Ptolemaeus allows to the Old Testament and the Law is strictly limited by the fact that even 'the pure legislation' requires completion, and by the fact that in the context of the salvation drama, the statements of the prophets that stem from the Mother or the spiritual seed are the breaking through of the world of the Pleroma into the world of the Demiurge, a world with which they have no essential relationship, and are not the working out of the one economy of salvation of the one God in history. (85)

The stage is now set for the coming of the Saviour. The character of the present section as salvation drama is clearly evident, as seen in the way that the events progress with a view to the redemption of the spiritual seed. The progress of the drama is assisted by the emphasis that is placed on the necessity of the seed's development, it must be made ready for the reception of the revelation. This of itself entailed the psychics, and here we have observed the different attitudes within the Valentinian school. In the Tractatus Tripartitus even the hylics have their part to play in the drama. The role of Christ in this section is not great, but indeed Ptolemaeus in particular insists that the Saviour was the real instigator of all that happened outside the Pleroma. In the other accounts the role of the Saviour

85. Cf. 'Les attaques des hérétiques ont poussé les auteurs catholiques à développer, à leur manière, l'idée d'un développement dans la révélation divine' (ibid., p.10).

is less important, but nevertheless it is Sophia restored by the Saviour who controls events.

III THE DESCENT OF THE SAVIOUR.

The very title of this section indicates the major concern in the present study. We shall be considering here the Christology of Valentinian Gnosticism, but shall do so from a particular point of view - that of the salvation drama. The salvation drama as we have followed it so far has laid the foundation for the descent of the Saviour and it is in relation to that drama that we must examine the Christology. Because of this, our attention will be focussed primarily on those sources in which it is possible to understand the Christology as a function of the salvation drama.

According to Hippolytus there is a fundamental distinction between the Eastern and Italian branches of Valentinian Gnosticism in respect of Christology.⁽¹⁾ The Italian school, in which Hippolytus includes Ptolemaeus and Heracleon considered that the body of Jesus was psychic, and the Holy Spirit descended as a dove (the Logos from Sophia) and raised the psychic body from the dead. The Eastern school (Hippolytus names Axionicus and Bardesianes) maintained that the body of the Saviour was spiritual, for the Holy Spirit (Sophia) was given

1. Ref. VI 35.5 - 7.

so that what had been given to Mary by the Spirit might be formed. While Hippolytus appears to have confused somewhat the roles of Sophia and the Saviour (or perhaps we should allow for later developments in Valentinianism) the major difference is clear and it can be observed in the sources at our disposal as well. Consequently we shall consider first Ptolemaeus, Heracleon and Marcus, who show 'Italian' characteristics, then Theodotus, who shows 'Eastern' characteristics, finally, the Gospel of Truth, which shows no marked signs of being either Italian or Eastern, will be discussed. References to and discussion of our other Valentinian sources, such as the Gospel of Philip and the treatise, De Resurrectione will be made at the appropriate points in the study. Material on the Christology of Valentinus himself (whom we have not yet mentioned) is so scanty that no useful conclusions can be drawn from it. In fragment three⁽²⁾ there is simply the statement that even the food that Jesus ate was not corrupted 'since he himself was incapable of corruption.'⁽³⁾

2. Hilg. 297; = Clement of Alex., Strom. III 59.3.

3. Fragment seven (Hilg. 302; = Eulogius of Alex. III, in Photius, Bibl., 230: 273b) which distinguishes the visible and invisible in Christ and not two natures is probably not by the Gnostic Valentinus. The question of the identification of the Valentinus mentioned here is discussed by Hilgenfeld (ad loc.), who considers that the Gnostic Valentinus is most likely the one meant. Foerster (op. cit., p. 96) queries this, but does not discuss it in detail.

For the salvation of the spiritual seed the Saviour now descends from the Pleroma. Only the Gospel of Philip sheds light on the descent itself: 'Jesus took them all by stealth, for he did not reveal himself as he really was, but he revealed himself as they would be able to see him. In this way he revealed himself to all these: he appeared as great to the great, he appeared as little to the little, he appeared to the angels as an angel, and to men as a man. Because of this his Logos hid itself from everyone.'⁽⁴⁾ Even so a descent here is implied only by the reference to the angels, which may have been the angels of the Demiurge.

In Ptolemaeus there is a very clear connection between the drama up to this point and the Christology. When the Saviour comes, he takes the first-fruits (ἀπαρχαί) of those he is going to save: he receives the pneumatic element from Achamoth; he puts on the psychic Christ from the Demiurge, and he surrounds himself with a body of the dispensation (τῆς οἰκονομίας σῶμα), which is of psychic substance, fashioned in an inexpressible way so as to be visible and palpable and passible. The Saviour in no way takes on the hylie for it is incapable of salvation.⁽⁵⁾

4. Ev. Ph. para. 26; cf. Asc. Is. 10.9 - 11 etc. The translation adopted follows the text as restored by Ménard.

5. adv. haer. I vi 1; H. i 52f.; Exc. ex Theod. 58.1 - 59.4.

Thus according to this scheme the Saviour in his 'incarnation' comprises four elements: the Saviour himself; the pneumatic element he received from Ahamoth; the psychic element he received from the Demiurge; and the psychic body of the dispensation.⁽⁶⁾ The emphasis here quite clearly lies on the connection between soteriology and Christology: the Saviour adopts what is to be redeemed. The Christology is at once an integral part of the drama.

The Christology of Heracleon does not differ markedly from that of Ptolemaeus. According to Heracleon the descent of Jesus to Capernaum (Jn 2.12) indicated the beginning of a new dispensation (οἰκονομία),⁽⁷⁾ that is, the dispensation of redemption. Capernaum is the extremity of the world, the region of matter, with which the Saviour has no affinity,⁽⁸⁾ and from which he later ascends.⁽⁹⁾ This radical distinction between the Saviour

6. These four elements are interpreted in a slightly different fashion a little later on. Irenaeus reports that some of them (clearly gnostics of a school of thought very similar to Ptolemaeus) say that the Demiurge produced Christ, his son, who is psychic. It was about him that the prophets spoke. He passed through Mary (διὰ Μαρίας), as water through a tube (καθάπερ ὕδωρ διὰ σωλήνος ὁδεύει) (This corresponds to the element of the dispensation). At his baptism the Saviour descends on him from the Pleroma in the form of a dove. There was also in him the spiritual seed from Ahamoth (adv. haer. I vii 2; H. i 60f.).

7. Heracleon, Frag. 11.

8. *ibid.*

9. Heracleon, Frag. 13.1 - 4.

and the world is also indicated by the explanation that, although 'salvation is of the Jews', full weight is to be given to the preposition, ἐκ, Jesus was born in Judea but not among the Jews (i.e. the psychics).⁽¹⁰⁾ Again, when John the Baptist says: 'Behold the lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world' (Jn 1.29), he indicates two things: the first phrase indicates the body of Jesus, and the second phrase 'He who is in the body.'⁽¹¹⁾ What kind of body is this? The word 'lamb' in this passage shows, according to Heraclion, that it is an imperfect body; a perfect body would have necessitated the use of the word 'ram',⁽¹²⁾ (i.e. fully grown and masculine).⁽¹³⁾ Two further passages illuminate the Christology. Solomon's Temple was built in 46 years. This, says Heraclion, is an image of the Saviour, the six is matter, the forty⁽¹⁴⁾ is the breath and the seed in the breath.⁽¹⁵⁾ The references to the image and to the seed in the breath make it clear that we have here to do with the psychic order of things, and the particular reference may be to the psychic Christ

10. Heraclion, Frag. 22.

11. Heraclion, Frag. 10.

12. *ibid.*

13. The importance of the male element is emphasised especially by Theodotus and the Gospel of Philip.

14. Four (= the tetrad of the Pleroma) multiplied by ten (= iota in Greek numbers, the initial letter of Ἰησοῦς).

15. Heraclion, Frag. 16.

produced by the Demiurge. (16) The tetrad (which multiplied by ten is forty) is described as 'unmixed' (*ἀπρόσμιλλος*), and the seed ultimately derived from it is therefore in but not of matter. If this is indeed a Christological passage, then the Saviour would appear to be 'in matter' and to comprise a hylic element therefore, though this of course is not an essential part of the Saviour's true nature. This would be in contrast to Ptolemaeus. On the other hand, the claim of John the Baptist that he is not worthy to loose the latchet of Jesus' sandal (Jn 1.27) leads Heraclion to comment that John means: 'I am not important enough that he should descend from the Greatness (i.e. the Pleroma) on my account and, as one puts on a sandal, should put on flesh (*σάρξ*), about which I cannot give an account, nor can I explain or resolve its dispensation. (17) This then is no ordinary flesh and probably Heraclion, with Ptolemaeus, saw in the Saviour four elements, the Saviour, the spiritual element, the psychic element and a psychic body of the dispensation. (18)

16. Cf. *adv. haer.* I vii 2; H. i 60f.; *Exc. ex Theod.* 47.

17. Heraclion, *Frag.* 8.28 - 32.

18. In regard to Fragment 16 (the exegesis of the forty-six years for the building of the Temple), Janssens (*art. cit.*, *Le Muséon* 72(1959), P. 133) wishes to maintain that 'cette définition du Sauveur met Heracléon à l'abri de tout soupçon de docétisme . . . : le Christ a bien un corps matériel', and furthermore, that 'le Logos est contenu dans le souffle de vie, et est donc donné au Sauveur dès la naissance (ce qui exclut l'hypothèse que le Logos ne serait descendu

Marcus sheds some additional light on the descent of the Saviour and the form of his earthly life. The redemption of man is to be accomplished by the descent of the Saviour, who brings with him the knowledge of the Pleroma, for he is himself the fruit of the Pleroma.⁽¹⁹⁾

'It is for this reason (to destroy ignorance) that the man ordered according to the image of the power above is said to have been chosen by his (sc. the Father's) will.'⁽²⁰⁾

Marcus goes right back to the very beginning: Just as the Aeons stem from the tetrad: Man, Church, Logos and Life, and from all the Aeons comes Jesus who will be revealed on earth, so in an analogous way 'that man was originated beside him (παρ' αὐτοῦ) through Mary according to the dispensation of redemption (κατ' οἰκονομίαν).'⁽²¹⁾ The four Aeons of the tetrad are represented by Gabriel, the Holy Spirit, the power of the highest (Lk. 1.35), and Mary. Through the work of these four, this man is brought into

18. (contd.) sur le Christ qu'au moment du Baptême).'

About this two points should be made: (1) Even if one admits that the flesh is real flesh, the Saviour is still in but not of flesh, which is to escape docetism by denying any real unity of person; (2) It is not the Logos but the seed that is in the breath (i.e. the seed from Achamoth), which still leaves room for the descent of the Saviour at Baptism.

19. adv. haer. I xv 2; H. i 149.

20. ibid.

21. adv. haer. I xv 3; H. i 150.

being 'through Mary', and 'him who passed through the womb (διελθόντα διὰ μητρὸς) the Father of all chose through the Logos to have knowledge of him.',⁽²²⁾ Since Mary in fact is no more than a tube (as one source expresses it)⁽²³⁾ it is clear that this man is in no way a material creature; he takes nothing essential from Mary. At first sight an earlier passage appears to contradict this. It is said that the person bearing the name of six letters (Jesus, the Saviour from the Pleroma)⁽²⁴⁾ clothed himself in flesh in order to be seen by men.⁽²⁵⁾ However, it is by no means certain that this is hylic flesh. In the first place it must be remembered that in Ptolemaeus the Saviour was given a psychic body of the dispensation that could be seen by men, and, in the second place, there is evidence that 'flesh' (σάρξ) was not understood in purely hylic terms by the Valentinians.⁽²⁶⁾ In view of the careful assertion that the man passed 'through' Mary, the flesh here is probably to be understood as psychic.⁽²⁷⁾

22. *ibid.*

23. See above, n. 6.

24. *adv. haer.* I xv 1; H. i 145.

25. *adv. haer.* I xv 2; H. i 149.

26. Cf. especially, *Ev. Ph.* para. 23, 72, and *Exc. ex Theod.* 1.1, and see the discussion on the resurrection of the flesh, below, pp. 506ff. See also pp. 444f.

27. Houssiau (*op. cit.*, pp. 156f.) points out the difference between the Christology of Ptolemaeus and that of Marcus. Ptolemaeus distinguishes four elements in the Saviour: the Saviour, the psychic Christ, the psychic body of the dispensation, and the spiritual seed. Marcus refers to the man formed according to the

When this (psychic) Jesus came to baptism 'there descended on him like a dove the one who ascended up again and completed the number twelve.'⁽²⁸⁾ The reference here is to the fact that Christ is not the direct emanation of an Aeon of the Pleroma but stemmed from Sophia outside the Pleroma and ascended because of his natural affinity with the Pleroma. In this one is 'the seed of those who are sown with him, who descend and ascend with him.'⁽²⁹⁾ These are the pneumatics who have a unique relationship with the Saviour, and it is to them that he comes. The Saviour is 'the seed of the Father',⁽³⁰⁾ and is 'the spirit that spoke through the mouth of Jesus, confessing that he is the son of man, and manifesting the Father. He descended on Jesus to be united with him.'⁽³¹⁾

The Christology that we have seen so far is clearly docetic, and with the fuller account in Marcus almost merits the coining of a new term: docetic adoptionism.

27. (contd.) dispensation (οἰκονομία). In other words, οἰκονομία in Marcus refers to the whole plan of redemption; in Ptolemaeus it refers to the psychic body that in a miraculous way is visible and palpable. For Marcus, the Man formed according to the dispensation is the whole psychic Christ, the image of the Saviour and the vehicle for him, not simply one element of the Saviour.

28. adv. haer. I xv 3; H. i 150.

29. ibid.

30. ibid.

31. adv. haer. I xv 3; H. i 150f.

It is docetic in that the body of Jesus is not a true material body but a psychic body that passes through Mary; it is adoptionist in that this figure is adopted, or fashioned according to the economy of redemption for the express purpose of being a vehicle for the Saviour from the Pleroma who shall descend into it. So, in Marcus the last passage continues: 'The Saviour Jesus of the dispensation destroyed death, and he made known his Father, Christ Jesus.' His Father, Christ Jesus, is the Saviour from the Pleroma who is manifested through the Jesus of the dispensation. 'Jesus, then, is the name of the man who is of the dispensation, who was appointed in the likeness and form of the man who should descend on him. When he received this man, he (sc. Jesus) himself had Man, Logos, Father and the Ineffable, and also Silence, Truth, Church and Life.'⁽³²⁾ Since he is the instrument for the manifestation of the Saviour from the Pleroma, Jesus fashioned according to the dispensation also has within him the ogdoad and hence the entire Pleroma (cf. Col. 2.9).

In Theodotus the connection between the drama and the Christology is, if anything, even more pronounced than in the Italian school. Jesus, the Saviour, descended from the Pleroma along with his angels. He is himself 'Angel of the Pleroma'⁽³³⁾ and, coming as he does from the Pleroma and being the 'assent of the All (for "the entire

32. adv. haer. I xv 3; H. i 151f.

33. Exc. ex Theod. 35.1.

Pleroma was in him bodily" (Col. 2.9)),⁽³⁴⁾ he possesses 'the redemption'.⁽³⁵⁾ When the Saviour descended Sophia emanated for him a fleshly element (σαρκίον), which is the spiritual seed with which the Logos is clad.⁽³⁶⁾ The identification of this fleshly element with the spiritual seed emanated by Sophia makes it clear that flesh here has nothing to do with the hylic element.⁽³⁷⁾ Nevertheless, this spiritual seed forms the visible part of the Saviour. The totality of the superior seed forms the body of the Saviour, it is Sophia herself as the prototype of the superior seed, the Church of the superior seed, that forms the 'flesh' of the Saviour.⁽³⁸⁾ 'The invisible part (sc. of the Saviour) is the Name, which is the Son, Only-Begotten.'⁽³⁹⁾ The Name (Only-Begotten) is the form of

34. Exc. ex Theod. 31. 1.

35. Exc. ex Theod. 35.2.

36. Exc. ex Theod. 1.1. Cf. Ev. Ph. para. 82: 'The Father of all united with the virgin who came down, and a fire shone for him on that day. He revealed the great bridal chamber. Because of this his body which came into being on that day came out of the bridal chamber, in the manner of him who came into being from the bridegroom and the bride.' The interpretation of this is not easy, but Janssens (art. cit., Le Muséon 81(1968) pp. 109f.), following Schenke, understands the Father of all and the virgin to refer to the Saviour and Sophia respectively. The body she understands to be a reference to the elect Gnostics (not the body of Jesus as Schenke), but she does not mention the close parallel to this in the Exc. ex Theod. 1.1. For other possible interpretations of the passage cf. the editions of Wilson and Menard, ad loc.

37. Cf. n. 26 above, and the references there.

the Aeons since he is the source of the entire Pleroma and of the knowledge of the Aeons.⁽⁴⁰⁾ There are, therefore, very clear links between the stages of the drama, even in the Christology itself. In that Christology as so far expressed, the Saviour is entirely spiritual, not only in his invisible part, but in his visible part too, since it comprises the totality of the pneumatics. This is in complete agreement with the characterisation of the Christology of the Eastern school of Valentinianism as given by Hippolytus.⁽⁴¹⁾ It is also to be noted that once again the Saviour assumes only that which he has come to save, for we noted in Theodotus less interest in the psychics than in Ptolemaeus.⁽⁴²⁾

The episode of the baptism of Jesus again demonstrates this Christology. Clement observes that 'the dove appeared as a body . . . which the followers of Valentinus call the spirit of the Father's Intention (*ἐνθυμήσις*), which made its descent on the flesh of the Logos.'⁽⁴³⁾ The dove which descends on Jesus at his baptism is 'the spirit of the Father's intention', who is in fact Only-Begotten, the source of the Pleroma and foundation for the Father's self-revelation.⁽⁴⁴⁾ In the baptism, then, the whole fount of

38. Exc. ex Theod. 26.1.

39. ibid.

40. Exc. ex Theod. 31.3.

41. Ref. VI 35.7.

42. See above, pp. 424ff.

43. Exc. ex Theod. 16.

44. Exc. ex Theod. 7.1.

the Pleroma is united with the flesh of the Logos, that is, with the spiritual seed that is the (spiritual) body of the Saviour.⁽⁴⁵⁾ It is also said, however, that the Name (Only-Begotten, the form of the Aeons) descended on Jesus in the form of a dove.⁽⁴⁶⁾ Jesus, in this last reference, is not the Saviour from the Pleroma, but is he here the body of the spiritual seed, or is this a psychic body? The section continues: 'Jesus himself needed redemption in order that he might not be restrained by the Thought of Deficiency in which he was placed, but advance through wisdom.'⁽⁴⁷⁾ This Jesus needs redemption and is therefore not the Saviour Jesus from the Pleroma who has redemption;⁽⁴⁸⁾ at the same time he is 'placed in' the Deficiency, i.e. in the material world, which indicates that he is not hylic. The natural inference would be that this Jesus is the psychic Jesus as in the system of Ptolemaeus. It is not impossible, however, that the reference here is still to the spiritual body of the Saviour, to the seeds, for elsewhere they are said to obtain redemption,⁽⁴⁹⁾ and the angels, their male counterparts, have already received redemption.⁽⁵⁰⁾ On the other hand, in the passion, Jesus hands over his spirit, i.e. this spiritual flesh given him by Sophia.⁽⁵¹⁾ Who, then,

45. Exc. ex Theod. 1.1.46. Exc. ex Theod. 22.647. Exc. ex Theod. 22.7.48. Cf. Exc. ex Theod. 35.2.49. Exc. ex Theod. 22.5; 73.2.50. Exc. ex Theod. 22.6.51. Exc. ex Theod. 1.2.

suffers? It may be that the Eastern school did stress the idea of the spiritual body, as Hippolytus suggests, but that it also envisaged a psychic element which 'suffers' and is possibly the Jesus who came to baptism.⁽⁵²⁾ If the body of the Saviour is entirely spiritual then we can point here to a marked difference between the Eastern and Italian schools on the question of salvation for the psychics. Ptolemaeus carefully integrates the psychics into his system; Theodotus is less concerned with them.⁽⁵³⁾ Furthermore, the Christologies are equally consistent. In both cases the Saviour takes on what he will save.

The Gospel of Truth presents a marked contrast to the way in which both the Italian and Eastern schools have integrated their Christology with the salvation drama in a thoroughly consistent manner. As we shall see in greater detail in the next section, in the Gospel of Truth the Word of the Father comes from the Pleroma to seek those who had gone astray but whose real home was also with the Father. He brings about their return by communicating to

52. See Sagnard, La gnose val., p. 525, n. 2.

53. On the other hand, Clement also says that according to the Valentinians Paul preached about the Saviour according to two plans: 'as begotten and passible on account of those of the left (the psychics) . . . and as being from the Holy Spirit and the virgin, according to the spiritual plan' (Exc. ex Theod. 23.3). This does not well agree with the Christology outlined above; it seems much more 'Western', and is a reminder of the composite nature of the document from which it comes. Cf. Sagnard, La gnose val., p. 523.

them the revelation of the Father. In a scheme in which redemption comes about through revelation it is not essential that the Word become incarnate in the true sense of the word. We must, then, examine the relationship between the redeemer and those he comes to save and the extent to which the Gospel of Truth displays a docetic Christology. Again we shall see in the next section that the author of the work seems to have made a conscious effort to include the cross of Christ in a scheme of salvation that does not strictly require a death at all. In addition to this, the death of Christ quite clearly moves the author, for he says: 'What great teaching, how sublime! He abases himself even to death, while eternal life clothes him. Having put off these perishable rags, he clothes himself with incorruptibility, which it is impossible for anyone to take from him' (20.27 - 34). While the author is obviously somewhat contemptuous of this fleshly existence, his statement that Christ abases himself to death, while clothed with eternal life, seems to emphasize the paradox of the Incarnation rather than weaken the reality of the human death of Christ. (54)

54. The emphasis on the death of Christ does not make the Gospel of Truth non-docetic or anti-gnostic (Arai, op. cit., p. 94). It may well make it less docetic than it might otherwise have been, but to avoid docetism the Christology must also be linked to a soteriology in which the historical has an essential role, and in the Gospel of Truth this link is maintained by the very slender connection of the book of the living with the testament of the Father that requires death for its revelation (Ev. Ver. 20.10 - 27). See below, pp. 472ff.

At another point the author says that when the Word appeared 'it was not only a sound, but it took a body ($\sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha$)' (26.7f.). Is this a genuine incarnation, or does the author deliberately avoid the word $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\acute{\iota}\varsigma$?⁽⁵⁵⁾ Even if the body is of real flesh is the Word merely in the body without having any essential relationship to it? Or are these all problems that never occurred to the author? The only other occurrence of $\sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha$ in the Gospel of Truth is equally indeterminate: 'The Father's love became a body ($\sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha$) upon the Word' (23.30f.). What kind of body is envisaged?⁽⁵⁶⁾ Another statement is just as ambiguous. The Spirit allows the initiated to taste, smell and touch the beloved Son (30.27 - 32). The references to taste and smell, far from being anti-docetic, suggest that the whole is to be understood metaphorically of the ability of those who have received the divine revelation, and they alone, to appreciate fully who Jesus is.⁽⁵⁷⁾

55. As Grobel suggests (op. cit., n. 251).

56. Again it is suggested that the author of the Gospel of Truth has avoided the word $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ (Arai, op. cit., p. 76).

57. R.M. Grant (Gnosticism and Early Christianity, 2nd ed. New York, 1966, p. 131) regards this as a post-resurrection appearance of Jesus (so also Giversen, according to Arai, op. cit., p. 77). Arai considers that the references could as well be to the earthly Jesus, since in early Christian literature similar expressions are used to emphasise the reality of Christ's body, i.e. are used anti-docetically (op. cit., p. 79 and the refs. there). But, on the one hand, with his strong emphasis on the revelation that Christ brings, the author of the Gospel of Truth is not primarily concerned with distinctions between pre- and post-

A final passage is the most important. 'Many received the light, they turned towards him. But the material (men) (ὕλη), were strangers (to him) and they did not see his form and they did not recognise him, for he came in similar flesh, and nothing impeded its (or, his) progress for it is incorruptibility and incoercibility' (30.36 - 31.8). Unfortunately this is no less ambiguous than the earlier passages. What is meant by 'similar flesh (ὁμογενὲς ἵσματος)'? The difficulty lies in the expression ἵσματος which is an attribute of the flesh. What does it in fact say about Christ's flesh? The most frequent use of ἵσματος in the Sahidic New Testament is as a translation for τύπος, τρόπος or ἐπιδείγμα,⁽⁵⁸⁾ but what would that mean in reference to the flesh? Arai,⁽⁵⁹⁾ for example, accepts the meaning 'Form' or 'Gestalt', but, while he objects to Schenke's version 'eine Fleischesgestalt' on the ground that in the Coptic 'flesh' is the substantive and 'form' the attribute, he himself is forced to follow a similar path with his own translation: 'mittels einer fleischlichen Gestalt'.⁽⁶⁰⁾ This eventually allows him to see in the

57. (contd.) resurrection appearances of Jesus, while, on the other hand, the terms 'taste' and 'smell' do not occur in the anti-docetic passages referred to by Arai.

58. See M. Willmet, Concordance du Nouveau Testament sahidique (Louvain, 1958, 1959; = CSCO 173, 183, 185)

59. op. cit., pp. 83 - 85.

60. This is grammatically correct. See Till, Koptische Grammatik, para. 117.

Gospel of Truth an absence of Docetism and instead an expression of the Spirit-Christology.⁽⁶¹⁾ Even if *CMAT* is translated as 'form', in what way does that qualify flesh? Other scholars see here a clear indication of Docetism; it is an apparent, a seeming, flesh.⁽⁶²⁾ The Greek presumed to underlie this is apparently *ὁμοίωμα* or *ὁμοίωσις*,⁽⁶³⁾ which recalls Phil. 2. 7 (*ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων*) and Rom. 8.3 (*ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας*), neither of which, however, is docetic. Grobel⁽⁶⁴⁾ has suggested that the Coptic represents the Greek *τοιαύτη . . . ἡ*, that is, flesh of such a kind that its passage cannot be impeded. That at

61. Arai, op. cit., p. 87.

62. Cf. the various translations: editio princeps, 'une chair de similitude', 'in einem Fleisch des Gleichnisses', 'in a similitude of flesh'; Till, 'in einem (nur) scheinbaren (d.h. nicht wirklich materiellen) Fleisch'; Isenberg, 'in the likeness of flesh'; etc. In a review of Arai's study J.E. Ménard writes: 'La thèse du Dr. Arai sur l'absence de docétisme dans l'Évangile de Vérité semble contredire la p. 31.4 - 6, *CMAT* y désignant bien la *ὁμοίωσις*: les choses d'en bas, dans le cas le Christ, sont l'image des choses d'en haut, i.e. des Éons et du Logos. A notre avis, tout le contexte de cette page est valentinien: le Logos s'est enveloppé d'une chair visible, image de sa forme authentique, *εὐε* (= *εἶνε*?) que les hyliques ne peuvent saisir. La pensée docétiste de l'auteur est ici manifeste' (in NT 7(1964-65), p. 333). See also the discussion by K. Rudolph in ThR 34(1969), pp. 199f.

63. See Grobel, op. cit., n. 331 and Ménard, in NT 7(1964-65), p. 333.

64. op. cit., n. 331.

once raises the question: Is this a post-resurrection appearance of Christ?⁽⁶⁵⁾ The question of docetism cannot be settled by this one phrase.⁽⁶⁶⁾ Nevertheless, nothing can alter the fact that the material men are strangers to the redeemer; but are they strangers because the flesh of the redeemer is not the same as their flesh, or because they are fundamentally incapable of seeing him for what he truly is because his flesh is the same as theirs?⁽⁶⁷⁾

In the light of all this, one is tempted to suggest with regard to the Christology of the Gospel of Truth that the author has not yet followed to its logical conclusion the fact that his antipathy to the flesh and his conception of redemption as a revelation to the elect make a genuine incarnation unnecessary.⁽⁶⁸⁾ The insistence on the death

65. So Grant, Gnosticism and Early Christianity, p. 131.

66. In any case, even if this passage is docetic, it cannot entirely undo the emphasis on the death of Christ at other points in the work. See H. Jones, The Gnostic Religion p. 195, n. 28.

67. Arai, op. cit., p. 84, interprets in the latter sense.

68. Cf. 'In view of the constant tendency in the Gnostic systems to minimize or even eliminate all references to the Passion, the statement, twice repeated, that "he was nailed to a cross of wood", and again that Jesus "knew that his death meant life for many" must be considered quite remarkable. Such statements are possible only to one who was consciously trying to accommodate his views to Christianity, or as van Unnik suggests, to one who, although he had Gnostic leanings, had not yet moved fully over to the Gnostic position' (R. McL. Wilson, The Gnostic Problem. A Study of the Relations between Hellenistic Judaism and the Gnostic

of Jesus in a work in which the death is not strictly necessary for revelation, raises in an acute form the question of whether or not the Gospel of Truth has a docetic Christology. To be sure, Christ is a stranger to the hylics, but that does not mean that the author has taken this to the extent of denying Christ a genuine humanity, as have Ptolemaeus, Heracleon, Marcus and Theodotus. This much at least is clear: the author of the Gospel of Truth does not appear to have linked Christology to the salvation drama in any decisive way.

As a further warning against thinking that the Valentinians adopted a Christology strictly in line with their salvation drama, by which one would expect the Saviour to be either pneumatic only or pneumatic and psychic and certainly not hylic, the Gospel of Philip and the De Resurrectione may be consulted. In the Gospel of Philip it is said that Jesus, by speaking of 'My Father who is in heaven', indicated that he had another father (para. 17). In terms of Valentinianism, this could be a reference to the father of the psychic Christ, which would bring Philip into line with the Italian school of Valentinianism. On the other hand, some scholars have considered that the 'other' father is in fact Joseph.⁽⁶⁹⁾ Thus the vehicle

68. (contd.) Heresy, London, 1958, p. 163).

69. In Ev. Ph. para. 17 the author maintains:

- (1) Mary did not conceive by the Holy Spirit.
- (2) Mary was not defiled by any Power.
- (3) Jesus had two fathers, one of whom was in heaven.

From this both Wilson (ad loc.) and Ménard (ad loc.)

for the Saviour from the Pleroma would be the natural son of Mary and Joseph.⁽⁷⁰⁾ In the treatise, De Resurrectione, the Saviour, as Son of Man was 'from above, a seed of Truth before this structure ($\sigma\upsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma$) had come into being' (44.34 - 36); he was an emanation of the Aeons (45.11 - 13); as Son of God he conquered death, swallowing it up; 'he put aside the world that is perishing. He transformed himself into an imperishable Aeon and raised himself up, having swallowed the visible by the invisible'.⁽⁷¹⁾ Nevertheless,

69. (contd.) conclude that Christ was not spiritual from his conception but (Ménard) from his Baptism, and the Gospel of Philip is therefore parallel to the Italian school of Valentinianism in respect of its Christology. However, we have seen above (p.404) that the psychic Christ is the product of the Demiurge. This seems to be at variance with (2) above. In the Apocryphon of John (II 24.15 - 17) the Archon defiled Eve and begat Eloim and Jahve. Mary was defiled by no Power, and has therefore, apparently, nothing to do with the Archon (= the Demiurge (?)). Ménard suggests that the parents of the psychic Christ are Mary and Joseph. But how could they produce a psychic body? Janssens (art. cit., in Le Muséeon 81(1968), pp. 86f.) accepts that Joseph is the 'other' father, but admits that this raises the problem that Mary is described as a virgin. This problem may be overcome, however, by reference to the fact that 'the perfect conceive through a kiss and give birth' (Ev. Ph. para. 31) (See Janssens, art. cit., pp. 86f., 107, 108 - 10, 114). Altogether this may provide a solution in which:

- (1) Mary and Joseph are the parents.
- (2) Mary remains a virgin.
- (3) The Christ who is born from the kisses is psychic (?).

70. Cf. the Carpocratians (adv. haer. I xxv 1; H. i 203f.).

it is said that the Saviour 'existed in flesh' (44.14f.) and 'possessed the humanity and the divinity' (44.25 - 27), and 'flesh' here means 'the external, corruptible nature of man'. (72)

One other passage of the Gospel of Philip deserves comment: 'Adam came into being from two virgins, from the Spirit and from the virgin earth. Because of this Christ was born of a virgin, in order that he might set in order the stumbling which came to pass in the beginning' (para. 83). There is a clear parallel here between Adam and Christ, but it is instructive to see how the parallel is used. Adam was from the virgin Spirit (Sophia), the origin of man's spiritual element, and from the virgin earth, the origin of his external material form. Christ likewise was from a virgin to set right the original fall. The real interest of the author here is in the parallelism of virginity. There is, however, a genuine link between Adam and Christ. Adam in paradise ate from the tree that produced beasts and so became a beast (para. 84), or even

71. De Res. 44.27 - 29; 45.14 - 21.

72. See Peel, *op. cit.*, pp. 112f. As Peel observes (*ibid.*), the evidence does not support the conclusion that the Letter presents a thoroughgoing docetic Christology. 'What our text does support is a Christology which maintains that the Saviour used a body of flesh only temporarily while on earth.' On the other hand, van Unnik goes too far in the other direction when he states that 'the author did not hold a docetic Christology' (van Unnik, *art. cit.*, JEH 15(1964), p. 149).

did not have anything but the food of beasts until Christ came to bring man the true food of man from heaven (para. 15). In this lies the clue to the context in which the Adam-Christ parallel must be set. Man as a spiritual being is from the Pleroma and Christ comes to bring what is needed for man to return there. The Adam-Christ parallel is found in a closely similar form in Irenaeus. Adam was made by God from the virgin earth and therefore Christ was born from a virgin to recapitulate Adam and make man after the image and likeness of God.⁽⁷³⁾ It is the context that marks the real difference here. In Irenaeus the interest lies in the redemption of the earthly Adam and his restoration to what God intended him to be. The Gospel of Philip presupposes a salvation drama that begins and ends in the Pleroma; Irenaeus presupposes a salvation history that begins on earth and leads to the recapitulation of the earthly Adam in the historical Christ.

The consistent thread that runs through this section is that the Saviour from the Pleroma makes use of the body that he adopts; that is, that he has no essential relationship with the body he uses. This is often emphasised by the 'adoption' of a body for the Saviour at the Baptism of Jesus. This lack of an essential relationship is true even in the case of the Italian school. There the psychics are more favourably viewed, but, as we shall see in the next section it is purely an act of charity on the part of the Saviour that he gives them a salvation

73. Dem. 32. Cf. below, pp. 64lff.

appropriate to their nature. The Saviour in no way becomes psychic. The Valentinians are all therefore docetists. The extent of their docetism varies, however, for the kind of body the Saviour employs differs from one source to another. In the Italian school, and perhaps the Eastern school too, the body is psychic. In the Gospel of Truth it may be flesh like ours or flesh only apparently like ours. In the De Resurrectione it is clearly flesh of our flesh; and in the Gospel of Philip the vehicle for the Saviour may have been psychic or perhaps the son of Mary and Joseph. From the point of view of the salvation drama there is no doubt that the members of the two 'schools' of Valentinianism have made a more conscious effort to integrate their Christology with the soteriology. While it is tempting to take a further step and say on the basis of that that works such as the Gospel of Truth, the Gospel of Philip and De Resurrectione are therefore representative of a less developed Valentinianism, the temptation must be resisted. Certainly, these works are at this point closer to 'orthodox' Christology, but that illustrates only the variety of Valentinian Gnosticism, and no conclusions about chronology may be drawn from this.

IV REDEMPTION

For the sake of convenience in handling this fairly substantial section, we shall divide the material somewhat arbitrarily into three sub-sections: the work of the

Redeemer; those redeemed; the means of grace. These cannot be treated entirely independently, especially the first two, and some crossing of the artificial boundaries is to be expected. Here again, at the risk of undue repetition, we should point out that we shall be considering redemption as an event in the salvation drama and not simply as an independent subject.

The Work of the Redeemer:

The work of the Redeemer as it appears from the accounts in Irenaeus and Clement is essentially a work of revelation. The Saviour comes to give the spiritual seed the formation according to knowledge. This is expressed in various ways: 'The Saviour having come, therefore, he awoke the soul and enkindled the spark; for the words of the Lord are power.'⁽¹⁾ With the coming of the Saviour the pneumatic seed blossoms into life,⁽²⁾ and even the soul, into which the seed was placed while the soul was asleep, is awakened. This is achieved by the words of the Saviour for they have power; that is, it is through the revelation that he brings. Under the image of Christ as the light the same thing is expressed: The phrase 'Let your light shine' (Mt. 5.16) indicates that the Light (i.e. the Saviour) has appeared and that the light (i.e. the spiritual seed that is

1. Exc. ex Theod. 3.1.

2. Exc. ex Theod. 3.2.

related to the Saviour) has been formed according to knowledge.⁽³⁾ The statement that the Light 'lightens every man coming into the world' (Jn 1.9) shows the effect of the Light (i.e. the Saviour) on the man (identified as 'the man of the superior seed', i.e. the pneumatic). When this man is enlightened he 'came into the world (κόσμος)', i.e. 'he set himself in order (ἐαυτὸν ἐκόσμησεν), separating off from himself the passions that darken him and are mixed with him.'⁽⁴⁾ The whole process of revelation is therefore the same as forming according to knowledge.

The redemption that the Saviour brings to the Gnostic is therefore parallel to the redemption that he brought to Sophia-Achamoth. The drama is repeated at each successive level. This is most clearly seen in Ptolemaeus. In the Pleroma, the Aeons were given their formation according to substance by Only-Begotten through Logos, and their formation according to knowledge through Christ, who teaches them about the Father.⁽⁵⁾ Achamoth is formed according to substance by Christ and according to knowledge by the Saviour.⁽⁶⁾ In the Valentinian himself the spiritual seed must be educated; he too, having been formed according to substance by the action of the Saviour on Achamoth, must be formed according to knowledge and so be perfected. He must become in reality

3. Exc. ex Theod. 41.3; cf. 3.1; cf. also Ev. Th. 24.

4. Exc. ex Theod. 41.3; cf. 67.4.

5. adv. haer. I i 1; H. i 9; I ii 5; H. i 21.

6. adv. haer. I iv 1; H. i 32; I iv 5; H. i 39.

what he already is potentially.⁽⁷⁾ He must be made aware of his true nature, and this the Saviour does by bringing the revelation from the Pleroma.

The inter-relationship of these stages of the drama can be grasped clearly from the fact that one statement about the redemption of the spiritual element may refer to any one of the stages of the drama. So, for example, in Heraclion's exegesis of the cleansing of the Temple (Jn 2. 14ff.):⁽⁸⁾ the whip made by Jesus (Jn 2.15) is 'the image of the power and operation of the Holy Spirit', the wooden handle of the whip is 'the figure of the cross', for 'by this wood the treacherous merchants (?) and the entire evil have been consumed and destroyed.' There is a clear reference here to Limit in the system of Ptolemaeus, the cross on which Christ was extended to form Achamoth according to substance. At the same time, in Heraclion, the whip also refers to the purification of the Church, as the same fragment indicates: Jesus cleansed the Temple because 'He wished to make his Church no longer a den of robbers and merchants, but a house of his Father.' The 'house of his Father' presupposes the knowledge or vision

7. Foerster is undoubtedly right when he observes that although the account of Irenaeus does not say in so many words that the pneumatic must be formed according to knowledge and the account in the Excerpta only hints at it, the formation of the pneumatic himself is presupposed by the whole system (art. cit., NTS 6(1959-60), p. 29).

8. Heraclion, Frag. 13.12 - end.

of the Father enjoyed by the elect pneumatics.⁽⁹⁾ Thus one statement about the redemption of the spiritual element can refer to the fall of Sophia, to Ahamoth, and to the pneumatic in this world.⁽¹⁰⁾

In the system of Ptolemaeus, even the cross of Christ is integrated into the concept of redemption as revelation and formation according to knowledge. The Saviour from the Pleroma, within his psychic body etc., remained always impassible, and the spirit of Christ (the pneumatic Church), was taken up from him when he was led before Pilate, for it too cannot suffer. Furthermore, the Saviour commends his soul (the psychic Church) into his Father's hands (i.e. into the hands of the Father of the psychic Christ, the Demiurge).⁽¹¹⁾ Thus both the pneumatic and the psychic Church escape suffering and death. Only the psychic body, the substance of the dispensation, suffers. This 'suffering' is endured so that through it 'the mother might show the type of the Christ above, the one who was extended on the

9. Cf. Exc. ex Theod. 64.

10. For a discussion of the relationship between the redemption of the individual and the salvation drama as a whole, see below, pp. 522 - 26.

11. Exc. ex Theod. 62.3. There appears to be a reflection here on the psychic level of the idea expressed elsewhere in the Excerpta on the pneumatic level (see above, pp.443f) that the Saviour commended his spirit, i.e. the pneumatics, into the hands of his Father, so that it escapes death when Jesus is crucified. See Sagnard, Extraits, ad loc.

Cross, and who formed Achamoth as a formation according to substance.'⁽¹²⁾ So the cross is reduced to the level of a revelatory sign of the separating off of the passions of the flesh. While this is far from being a theology of the cross in any orthodox sense, it must be admitted that it is thoroughly consistent with the salvation drama in Ptolemaeus.

Our most complete statement on the work of the Redeemer is to be found in the Gospel of Truth, in the context of course of its own salvation drama.⁽¹³⁾ The Redeemer comes from the Father for the redemption of those who had gone astray from the Father, and indeed for them only. To these the Redeemer brings revelation about the Father, ignorance of whom had led to the fall, and revelation about the origin and destiny of those who had fallen. The coming of the Saviour effects a judgement on the work of Error and leads to the rescue of the fallen spiritual element and the setting of it on the path that leads back to the Father and ultimate unity with him. Let us examine this more closely.

We have seen above⁽¹⁴⁾ that the Son is the Father's name, and is therefore, in a real sense, himself the

12. adv. haer. I vii 2; H. i 62; Exc. ex Theod. 61.5 - 7.

13. On the work of the Redeemer see also J. Zandee, art. cit., in Numen 11(1964), pp. 56 - 64.

14. See above pp. 359ff.

revelation of the Father. The Son is 'the one who came forth from the Depth ($\beta\alpha\theta\omicron\varsigma$), spoke his secrets, knowing that the Father is absolute goodness' (40.26 - 29). The relationship between the Word and the Father is made equally explicit elsewhere. The wisdom, intelligence, knowledge, joy, glory, image, rest, love and confidence⁽¹⁵⁾ of the Father are all associated with the Word,⁽¹⁶⁾ and 'thus the Word of the Father advances in the All, being the fruit of his heart and the expression of his will' (23.18 - 24.3). The Word comes 'from the Pleroma, (the Word) who is in the thought and mind of the Father.'⁽¹⁷⁾

The work of the Redeemer is in the first place a work

15. Barrett (art. cit., p. 168) suggests that these may be the Father's emanations.
16. Grobel, op. cit., n. 185, considers that the wisdom, intelligence, etc., are not of the Father but of the book; Till, on the other hand (ZNTW 50(1959), p. 173, ad loc.), considers that these features of the Father are associated with the book. These two interpretations and the one above are all possible, but the one above is to be preferred since the passage goes on to talk about the Word who is from the thought and mind of the Father. See also C.I.K. Story, The Nature of Truth in "The Gospel of Truth" and in the Writings of Justin Martyr. A study of the Pattern of Orthodoxy in the middle of the Second Christian Century (Leiden, 1970; = Supplements to NT 25), pp. 10f., 105f.; Arai, op. cit., pp. 73 - 76; and the editio princeps, ad. loc.
17. Ev. Ver. 16.34 - 36. The sentence could also mean 'the Pleroma that is in the thought and mind of the Father', but this is unlikely. See Grobel, op. cit., n. 9, and Till, Orientalia 27(1958), p. 271.

of revelation. 'By this (sc. the gospel) He (sc. Christ) has given light to those in darkness because of Oblivion. He gave them light; he gave them a way (*ΜΑΕΙΤ*),⁽¹⁸⁾ and the way is the truth that he taught them' (18.16 - 21). Again it must be observed that Christ is in effect the content of the revelation, for later he is described as a way for the erring, knowledge for the ignorant, discovery for those who sought, stability for the wavering, purity for the impure (31.28 - 35). The content of the revelation is knowledge:⁽¹⁹⁾ on the one hand, knowledge of the Father. The Son appeared: 'He instructed them about the Father, the incomprehensible one; he breathed into them that which is in the thought, doing his will.'⁽²⁰⁾ Furthermore, 'the Father reveals his breast (and his breast is the Holy Spirit), he reveals that of him which is hidden (that of him which is hidden is his Son), in order that, through the compassions of the Father, the Aeons may know him and cease to strive in search of the Father.'⁽²¹⁾ The

18. Here the word clearly means 'way' not 'space'. See above, p. 371, n. 55.

19. Story (op. cit., p. 88) sees this presented in the 'parables' of the Gospel of Truth.

20. Ev. Ver. 30.32 - 36; cf. 31.9 - 13.

21. Ev. Ver. 24.9 - 18. Cf. adv. haer. I ii 5; H. i 21. Grobel (op. cit., nn. 211, 213) regards the words in parentheses as interpolations. Story (op. cit., p. 13) translates the passage as follows: 'The Father reveals his breast (now his breast is the Holy Spirit who reveals this hidden one of his; this hidden one of his is his Son), etc.' If, however, revelation is the

search for the Father is ended by the Father's revelation of himself through the Son, a revelation that is appropriated by the gift of the Spirit.⁽²²⁾ On the other hand the revelation includes the giving of the knowledge of where the spiritual being has come from and where he is going to. It is self-knowledge.⁽²³⁾ The Father sends his Son (or Name) 'to speak about the place (τόπος) and his place of rest, from which he came. . . . He will speak about the place from which each one came.'⁽²⁴⁾

The work of the Redeemer is by no means simply revelation; it is directly associated with the implementation of the return of the spiritual beings to the Father. The Redeemer performs a work that has an essential role in the movement of the salvation drama in the Gospel of Truth. Christ causes the All to return to its origin,⁽²⁵⁾ and even

21. (contd.) prerogative of the Father (Grobel, op. cit., n. 47) then this interpretation must fall.
22. On the role of the Spirit in the Gospel of Truth see, e.g. Arai, op. cit., pp. 77 - 79; Story, op. cit., pp. 19f., 147f.
23. On the nature of knowledge as knowledge both of the Father and of oneself, see J.E. Ménard, 'La "connaissance" dans l'Évangile de Vérité', in RevSR 41(1967), pp. 1 - 28, esp. pp. 1 - 3, 12f., 28.
24. Ev. Ver. 40.31 - 41.5; cf. adv. haer. III xv 2; II. ii 81; De Res. 43.34 - 44.3.
25. Ev. Ver. 24.6 - 8. Cf. 'Before Christ some came forth. Whence they came they are no longer able to go in, and they went where they are no longer able to come out. But Christ came. Those who went in he brought out, and those who went out he brought in' (Ev. Ph. para. 70).

precedes the redeemed to the place from which they strayed. The final outcome of the Redeemer's work is to bring about the re-union of the spiritual beings with the Father: 'When the truth made its appearance, all its emanations (?) recognised it. They greeted the Father in truth with a perfect power, being reunited by it (sc. the power) to the Father. For each one loves the truth since the truth is the mouth of the Father; his tongue is the Holy Spirit, the one who attaches him to the truth, attaching him to the mouth of the Father by his tongue when he receives the Holy Spirit.'⁽²⁷⁾ Whatever one makes of this strange figure, there is no doubt about the unity established between the Father and his emanations (?) by the work of the revealed truth (i.e. Christ) and the Spirit.⁽²⁸⁾ The Redeemer by his revelation brings life and light (31.13 - 16) to those estranged from the Father and from their true selves. The work of the Redeemer is also regarded as a rescue operation, the saving of the lamb in the pit (32.18 - 22).

A similar idea of redemption as a work of rescue is expressed in the parable of the lost sheep:⁽²⁹⁾ He (sc. the Son) is the shepherd who left the ninety-nine sheep

26. Ev. Ver. 22.20 - 27; cf. 41.5 - 14.

27. Ev. Ver. 26.27 - 27.4. Grobel (op. cit., n. 267) regards the passage 'since the truth . . . attaches him to the truth' as an interpolation.

28. Cf. Ev. Ver. 19.30 - 34.

29. It is interesting to compare the different interpretations of the parable of the lost sheep in our extant Gnostic sources. In addition to the passage in the

who had not strayed. He went in search of that which was lost. He rejoiced when he had found it. For the ninety-nine

29. (contd.) Gospel of Truth there are five passages in Irenaeus to be considered, and a reference in the Gospel of Thomas:

(1) adv. haer. I viii 4; H. i 73. Achamoth is identified as the lost sheep that is sought by the Saviour. Nothing is said about the ninety-nine, about deficiency, about the left and right hands.

(2) adv. haer. I xvi 1; H. i 158. The lost sheep is the twelfth Aeon of the duodecad, which has the digamma. Again nothing is said about the ninety-nine, about the deficiency, about the left and right hands, and the work of the shepherd is not mentioned either.

(3) adv. haer. I xvi 2; H. i 159 - 61. First it is shown by calculations that the ogdoad is the mother of the thirty Aeons, and then that the total becomes ninety-nine. These calculations depend on the absence of the digamma. Thus the Pleroma of Aeons without the fallen Sophia totals only ninety-nine. Then it is shown that λ is (a) the Logos; (b) in the eleventh place alphabetically (i.e. the twelfth Aeon has fallen); (c) has the numerical value thirty (i.e. the Logos is the sum of all the Aeons). But the sum of all the numbers from α to λ without the digamma is ninety-nine. Once again the Aeons total only ninety-nine after the fall of Sophia, the twelfth Aeon of the duodecad. But, λ , the eleventh, descends to find the one that is like it in order to complete the twelfth. If the preceding calculations have any significance at all, then the completion of the twelfth also makes the ninety-nine into one hundred, and the Aeons are restored. Here the deficiency is the loss of the one Aeon and the Saviour's work consists in bringing back the one that is lost, but not for its own sake; for the sake of the remaining Aeons. There is no mention here of sheep or of left and right hands.

is a sum (counted) on the left hand, which holds it. But as soon as the one is found the entire number passes over

29 (contd.)

(4) adv. haer. I xvi 2; H. i 161. The Gnostics claim that through knowledge they escape from the place of the ninety-nine, that is the deficiency, the type of the left hand, and through the addition of one to the ninety-nine are transferred to the right hand. Here the one that is added is identified with knowledge, the place of the ninety-nine with deficiency and the left hand, from which escape is had by the addition of one to the ninety-nine. Again sheep are not mentioned.

(5) adv. haer. II xxiv 6; H. i 341f. The left hand is identified with material things that perish. The Saviour comes to the lost sheep to transfer it from the left hand to the right hand, to the ninety-nine sheep who have remained in the fold. Irenaeus points out that the Gnostics are inconsistent since these ninety-nine are also in the left hand and can therefore not yet have the peace of salvation.

(6) In the Gospel of Thomas the shepherd leaves the ninety-nine to seek for the one lost sheep which is the largest and the most loved (Ev. Th. 107).

Through all this there run two quite different emphases: the rescue of the one that is lost; the completion of the ninety-nine by the addition of one. In (1), (2) and (6) above, the first idea is present, in (3) the second idea. In (4) both ideas are present and therein lies the confusion. Ninety-nine is in the first place the left hand, the deficiency from which the bringing of knowledge effects an escape; but secondly, ninety-nine has one added to it to bring about redemption of the ninety-nine. In (5) Irenaeus himself has combined the two ideas polemically. The initial thought is the rescue of the lost sheep from

to the right hand. So it is with him who lacks it, that is, the entire right hand, which draws (to itself) that which

29 (contd) the left hand, that is from matter, and its return to the ninety-nine sheep who did not stray. Irenaeus then draws on (4) to show that the Gnostics are illogical, for the ninety-nine are also in the left hand, and cannot obtain full salvation until the one is rescued. In spite of his polemic Irenaeus is correct; the rescue of the one is the completion of the all.

Where does the Gospel of Truth stand in relation to all this? It is closest to (4) and (5) above, and indeed Ménard (L'Évangile de Vérité, p. 150) considers that the parallel with (4) is so close that we may say 'que nous avons affaire ici, soit à une source immédiate de Marcus, soit à une oeuvre de sa propre main, soit enfin à l'oeuvre d'un disciple immédiat.' Cf. also Grobel, op. cit., pp. 18f., n. 361; Arai, op. cit., pp. 111 - 14; van Unnik, in The Jung Codex, pp. 96f.; Story, op. cit., pp. 97 - 99.

lacks it, takes it from the left side and transfers (it) to the right, and so the number becomes one hundred. The meaning of what is in their sound is the Father' (31.35 - 32.17). The work of the redeemer lies in the first place in the rescue of the one sheep that was lost. A number of other themes on redemption emerge from this same parable, however. The rescue of the one that was lost has its effect on the ninety-nine who had not strayed. They were incomplete without the hundredth. So the saving of the one brings about the completion of the all; with the addition of one 'the entire number passes over.'⁽³⁰⁾ Salvation, therefore, in the fullest sense is possible only when all the elect are gathered in. A further idea in the parable of the lost sheep is that the redeemer fills up the deficiency of him who lacks the one. This may be understood of the Father,⁽³¹⁾ who in a sense needs all the Aeons to return to him, just as they need to return since he retains their perfection. This idea of providing the one thing needed for completion may also serve as a paradigm for anyone who in the gnostic sense is drunk, ignorant or asleep, etc.⁽³²⁾ Whether this latter

30. On the details of the system of counting see, e.g., Grobel, op. cit., nn. 353 - 58, and H.I. Marrou, 'L'Évangile de Vérité et la diffusion du comput digital dans l'antiquité', in VC 12(1958), pp. 98 - 103.
31. So Story, op. cit., p. 98.
32. That this is a real possibility is attested by the closest parallel to the parable in the account of Irenaeus. See above, n. 29 (4).

theme is expressed in the present passage or not, it certainly occurs in the parable of the physician.⁽³³⁾

In addition to his work for those who through inability to know have been led into error, and consequently into Error's works, the coming of the Redeemer has a dire effect on Error and Error's derivatives. The coming of the Redeemer is a judgement. 'When the Word made its appearance . . . there was a great confusion among the jars, for some were emptied and others were filled, some were supplied, others were overturned, some were sanctified, others were broken in pieces' (26.4 - 15). The jars seem to represent men in general⁽³⁴⁾ who, with the coming of the Word from heaven in judgement (25.35 - 26.4), are divided into different categories, or rather, the categories to which each belongs become apparent, for the Word does not exercise an external judgement but is in the hearts of those who pronounce it (26.5f.). 'All the spaces (ΜΑΕΙΤ) were disturbed and confused, for they had no fixity or stability' (26.15 - 18). The 'spaces' here may well be 'terror's empty spaces' into which Jesus penetrated (20.34 - 36), for the Gospel of Truth goes on to talk about the

33. Ev. Ver. 35.30 - 36.5 (quoted in full above, pp. 420ff.); cf. 24.21 - 32. Story (op. cit., pp. 94 - 100) regards the filling of deficiency as the theme of several parables in the Gospel of Truth.

34. Grobel (op. cit., n. 253) sees a sudden allegorization at this point.

effect of the coming of the Word on Error. Error is in agony and torment 'because it knew nothing'; Knowledge comes, which is the annihilation of Error; Error becomes empty, there being nothing in it (26.18 - 27). Thus, the coming of the Redeemer is not only revelation and return for those who came from the Father, it is the end of Error and its works. The Redeemer by knowledge puts an end to the torments and afflictions suffered by those who had been led astray from the Father's face (31.21 - 28). In this way the redemption is closely linked with the salvation drama.

Not only is there a clear connection between the beginning of the drama and the redemption, but the central place allotted to the Redeemer is indisputable. Two further passages, however, require separate consideration, for in them it is plain that the author of the Gospel of Truth has attempted to integrate the cross of Christ into his theology. Where in the system of Ptolemaeus we saw that the cross has become a symbol of the cutting off of worldly passions (an interpretation completely consistent with the salvation drama in Ptolemaeus), in the Gospel of Truth the cross is the place of the real death of Jesus, a death furthermore to which the author attaches saving significance, despite the fact that in our examination of the drama so far there has been no indication that the circumstances should demand a consideration of the cross at all. The revelation that the Redeemer brings in no way necessitates the death of Christ.

In the first passage, Error becomes angry with Jesus

because he reveals the truth to those in darkness because of Error (18.15 - 21): 'Therefore Error was enraged with him; it persecuted him, it oppressed him, it brought him to naught. He was nailed to a tree; he became a fruit of the knowledge of the Father, but which did not destroy because they ate it; rather, to those who ate it, it granted that they should become a rejoicing because of this discovery.'⁽³⁵⁾ The significance of the cross here lies not in the death of Christ at all, but in the parallel with the tree of the garden of Eden.⁽³⁶⁾ The Son is the revelation

35. Ev. Ver. 18.21 - 29. The Coptic text is difficult in the first sentence: the pronoun objects could be either masculine (i.e. referring to Jesus) or neuter (referring presumably to the gospel), and the verbs translated 'oppressed' and 'brought to naught' should perhaps be rendered 'was oppressed' and 'came to naught'. The editio princeps, Till, Ménard and Wilson (NTA I, p. 524) all take the verbs as transitive and active respectively and the pronouns as masculine - as above. Grobel takes the verbs as intransitive and absolute respectively and the pronouns as neuter and translates: 'Because of this, Planē was enraged at it, she persecuted it: she was endangered by it, and brought to naught.' This makes for a very abrupt transition to the next statement: 'He was nailed to a tree.' Isenberg translates: 'For this reason error was angry with him, (so) it persecuted him. It was distressed by him, (so) it made him powerless.' Haardt translates: 'Confusion therefore grew angry with Him, persecuted Him, (Confusion however) was oppressed by Him and annihilated.'

36. Cf. Irenaeus who sees the contrast between the trees not simply in terms of ignorance and knowledge, but as the locus of disobedience and obedience. See below, pp. 651ff.

of the Father, and through being nailed to the tree, the tree becomes a tree of knowledge,⁽³⁷⁾ and Jesus becomes a fruit that brings knowledge of the Father. Yet he does so quite apart from the cross, and the present passage is not an interpretation of the saving death of Christ, but an attempt to integrate the cross into a salvation drama in which it is not essential. That is not to say, however,⁽³⁸⁾ that the Gospel of Truth regards that death as an illusion.

The second passage is much longer and more complex. It concerns the book of the living.⁽³⁹⁾ This book is manifested in the hearts of the little children taught by Jesus (19.34 - 36), and is therefore in some sense to be equated with the revelation brought by Christ from the Father. The book also contains the names of the living, those who have received the revelation (21.3 - 6). The two ideas are in fact one, for in Gnostic thought, to receive a revelation is to know not only about the Father

37. Cf. Ev. Ph. para. 94.

38. Cf. 'Doubtless the writer views the cross as historical, historical however, to others. Its historicity is not important to him. Thus, he gives no names of persons or places relating to Jesus' crucifixion, affirming only that Christ achieves something by his crucifixion' (Story, op. cit., p. 124).

39. On the relationship of this to the New Testament passion narratives see van Unnik, in The Jung Codex, pp. 108 - 12.

but also about oneself,⁽⁴⁰⁾ and one of the things known is that one's name is in the book of the living because one has received the revelation.⁽⁴¹⁾ This book also pre-exists, being 'written in the thought and mind of the Father and, before the foundation of the All, being in his incomprehensibility.'⁽⁴²⁾ The pre-existence emphasises that the revelation is determined by the Father's will, and the book of the revelation is virtually identified with the Word who also is 'in the thought and mind of the Father' (16.34 - 36). At the same time, the pre-existence of the book underlines the experience of the one who receives the revelation, who knows whence he comes and where he goes.⁽⁴³⁾ Until the book appears, those who believed in salvation cannot be revealed (20.6 - 9), and the All must remain hidden like an unopened will (20.14 - 19), for the book is the revelation of the Father, and the Father is invisible until Christ reveals him. There can then be no salvation apart from revelation; salvation is pure gift.

Once again there is no logical necessity for the revelation of the book to involve the death of Jesus, but

40. Cf. 'If you will know yourselves, then you will be known and you will know that you are the sons of the Living Father' (Ev. Th. 3).

41. Cf. Grobel, *op. cit.*, n. 127.

42. Ev. Ver. 19.36 - 20.3. Cf. Grobel, *op. cit.*, n. 99.

43. Ev. Ver. 22.13 - 15; cf. Exc. ex Theod. 78.2; adv. haer. I xxi 5; H. i 187.

nevertheless that death has been integrated into the salvation drama by virtue of the fact that the book has been interpreted as the Father's testament, and like any will or testament death is required for its implementation.⁽⁴⁴⁾

'Therefore, the merciful one, the faithful one, Jesus, was patient, enduring the sufferings until he had taken that book, since he knew that his death is life for many' (20.10 - 14). The All remains hidden, like an unopened will:

'Therefore Jesus appeared. He opened that book.'⁽⁴⁵⁾ He was nailed to a tree, he fastened the testament (δικταγμα) from the Father on the cross' (20.22 - 27). In this way the death of Jesus on the cross is seen as an integral part of the giving of the revelation, and is therefore also the

44. Arai (op. cit., p. 104) sees no connection between the book that Jesus takes and the will or testament. The unopened will refers only to the hiddenness of the All. But this ignores the fact that the author emphasises the necessity of death for the implementing of the will, and the fact that, after the reference to the will the next sentence begins: 'Therefore (ΕΤΒΕ ΠΕΕΙ) Jesus appeared.' See further, Story, op. cit., pp. 126 - 33, who demonstrates the connection of thought between the various parts of this section, Ev. Ver. 19.34 - 20.27.

45. The text reads: ΔΥΒΑΛΕΥ ΜΠΙΧΩΜΕ ΕΤΗΜΕΥ 'He clothed himself with that book'. The editio princeps suggests a misunderstanding of the Greek ἀναλαμβάνειν, which can mean both 'to put on' and 'to take up'. Till, Isenberg and Wilson (NTA I, p. 524) all use a form of the verb 'to take'. Grobel (op. cit., n. 114) emends to read: ΔΥΒΑΛΠΕΥ, 'he opened that book.' Arai (op. cit., p. 101, n. 1) accepts this emendation. Story (op. cit., p. 129) accepts the literal meaning of the text and

turning point of the salvation drama. To the extent that the revelation is tied to these historical events, one may speak of an historical revelation, but the movement in which this occurs is not strictly a movement of history at all. (46)

In many ways an even more interesting light is shed on the Valentinian understanding of the death of Christ by the treatise, De Resurrectione. As we have seen above, (47) the Saviour wears flesh as a kind of temporary garment. Nevertheless, he apparently undergoes a real death (46.15 - 17). However, in his essential nature the Saviour is superior to death. Because he was Son of God he conquered death (44.27 - 29). He destroyed death and is therefore to be regarded as a great one (46.17 - 20). It is even said that 'The Saviour swallowed up death' (45.14f.) The full significance of this can be grasped only when we understand what the author means by 'death'. Not only does it say that the Saviour destroyed death, it also says that he destroyed evil (45.9); death, then, is evil. The Saviour swallowed up death because 'he put aside the world which is perishing' (45.16f.). Or as another passage puts it: 'He swallowed the visible by the invisible and gave us the way

45. (contd.) understands it as a reference to the fact that the chosen ones are the body of Christ and suffer with him (cf. also Ménard, L'Évangile de Vérité, ad loc.).

46. See Story, op. cit., pp. 75f., 82, 130.

47. See above, pp. 454f.

of our immortality.' (48) Death, then, is part of the evil, visible, perishing world. It is not death as the wages of sin that the Saviour swallows up and destroys, but death as the Law of Nature to which all men are subject. (49) As Malcolm Peel observes, the cross is nowhere mentioned in the treatise, 'and salvation has to do with flight from a corruptible world rather than with the reconciliation of man to God.' (50) Nevertheless, such an understanding of the Saviour's defeat of death fits well into a salvation drama in which the first part of the drama is a descent into matter, and the second part an escape from it.

In fact, in this conception of salvation as an escape from physical death the De Resurrectione is close to an idea expressed by Valentinus himself: 'You wished death to be divided among yourselves, so that you might consume it and destroy it, and that death might be put to death in you and through you: for when you dissolve the world, you are not dissolved, you lord it over creation and all corruption.' (51) The salvation drama is concerned with the escape from all material and corruptible things, of which the most obvious sign is death. The difference between this passage by Valentinus and the ideas expressed by the author of the De Resurrectione lies in the fact

48. De Res. 45.19 - 23; cf. 48.16 - 19.

49. De Res. 44.17 - 21. See Peel, op. cit., pp. 117 - 20.

50. Peel, op. cit., p. 123.

51. Valentinus, Frag. 4; Hilg. 298 = Clement of Alex. Strom. IV 89.1 - 3. Cf. also Ev. Ph. para. 3; Ev. Th. 11; Ep. Iac. Apoc. 4.31 - 6.20, esp. 6.7 - 18.

that in the latter it is Christ who defeats death and the Gnostic defeats it by participating in the resurrection that Christ brought.

Marcus also interprets the cross and links it decisively with the salvation drama through an association with the number six. Because the Saviour bears the number six 'therefore Moses said that man was created on the sixth day, and therefore the dispensation of redemption (οἰκονομία) took place on the sixth day, the παρασκευή, (52) when the last man appeared for the regeneration of the first man. The beginning and end of this dispensation (οἰκονομία) was the sixth hour, in which he was fixed to the tree. For the perfect Mind, knowing that the number six has power for creation and regeneration, manifested to the son of light, through the appearance of the Episeimon in him, the regeneration which came to be through him. (53) In the references here to the economy of salvation in which the first man is redeemed by the last man, or the new man, we have a clear indication of the salvation drama, and also a theme that is prominent in Irenaeus. As we shall see, (54) the theme in Irenaeus concerns the first man made of the earth by God and redeemed by the Son of God, who by his incarnation from the virgin recapitulates in himself the first man and establishes a new humanity of which he is himself the head. In the present context the creation and regeneration concern only the 'sons of light', (55) but

52. Translated 'cena pura'.

53. adv. haer. I xiv 6; H i 140f.

within that context, the Saviour who descends is for the sons of light the new man, and he offers them regeneration through the cross; that is, he makes possible the crucifying or cutting off of the passions associated with the material world.

The Redeemed:

We turn now to consider those who are redeemed by the Saviour. The most complete account of this is to be found in Heracleon's exegesis of the pericope on the Samaritan woman (Jn 4), and from this we can gain a clear picture of the progress of the pneumatic element to redemption, the work of the Saviour, and the relation of this to the salvation drama.⁽⁵⁶⁾ As we have already seen, the pneumatic seeds are sown by Christ and reaped by the Saviour.⁽⁵⁷⁾ The pneumatic element is represented or figured by the Samaritan woman. The Samaritan woman, 'who is of a pneumatic nature, has committed fornication.'⁽⁵⁸⁾ This fornication is 'the total hylic evil'⁽⁵⁹⁾ into which the pneumatic element has fallen. This is especially shown by

54. See below, pp. 642ff., 684ff.

55. Cf. adv. haer. I xiv 4; H. i 137.

56. On the Valentinian exegesis of the passage see C. Barth, *op. cit.*, pp. 76 - 80. On the gnostic significance see Sagnard, La gnose val., pp. 494 - 506.

57. See above, p. 392, n. 114.

58. Heracleon, Frag. 24.

59. Heracleon, Frag. 18.24.

Heracleon's claim that the woman has had six husbands, (60) six being the number of matter. (61) But this 'fornication' does not fundamentally affect the Samaritan woman. Thus even Origen himself misses the point when he states that to speak of sin in connection with a spiritual being is a contradiction in terms. (62) Furthermore, the fact that 'the Father seeks' (Jn 4.23) indicates that he seeks the pneumatic element 'related to the Father', the element that is lost 'in the deep matter of error'. (63) When Jesus tells the woman to go and call her husband (Jn 4.16), she answers 'becomingly' and 'as befits her nature.' (64) In other words she tells the truth, that she has no husband. In this is indicated that she recognises that she is a pneumatic and therefore has no real husband on earth. Then by questioning Jesus she indicates the cause of her fornication: 'ignorance of God and failing to offer worship to God'. (65) The fault is ignorance and the remedy knowledge, and this takes us right back to the start of

60. *ibid.* Probably the figure six reflects neither a corrupt text nor a deliberately false reading as Origen suggests (*ibid.*, lines 22f.), but the inclusion of the husband whom the woman now has (Jn 4.18) with the five previous husbands. See Janssens, *art. cit.*, Le Muséon 72(1959), p. 135.

61. Heracleon, Frag. 16.

62. Heracleon, Frag. 18.27 - 36.

63. Heracleon, Frag. 23; cf. Ev. Ver. 17.14 - 21.

64. Heracleon, Frag. 19.

65. *ibid.*

the salvation drama. The spiritual element that stems from the Father has fallen into material evil and ignorance and must be sought. Valentinus's description is rather more picturesque, but the meaning is essentially the same: the heart, until it receives enlightenment from the Father, is like a tavern; it is 'the dwelling of many demons'.⁽⁶⁶⁾

We have now reached the point of conversion. The pneumatic seed has become aware of its true nature. The idea of growth that coincides so readily with the concept of seed or sowing also receives some emphasis. The moment of conversion is the culmination of growth; the seed has come to maturity, and is 'ready for salvation and reception of the Logos'.⁽⁶⁷⁾ The process of conversion and the role of the Logos can be seen in some detail. Jesus offers the Samaritan woman living water, water that gives life that is eternal, as opposed to the water from the well, from which Jacob's flocks drank, water of the Old Testament, of the Demiurge, of this world, psychic. The offer of living water, i.e. the knowledge that she lacked, evokes in the Samaritan woman a response of 'faith that is without indecision and in conformity with her own nature'.⁽⁶⁸⁾ The Samaritan woman's request that Jesus give her this water

66. Valentinus, Frag. 2; Hilg. 295f. = Clement of Alex.

Strom. II 114.3 - 6.

67. Heracleon, Frag. 33; cf. 32, 34 - 36.

68. Heracleon, Frag. 17.30f.

(Jn 4.15) shows the conversion of the pneumatic away from the hylic and psychic to the pneumatic.⁽⁶⁹⁾ In a real sense she must believe.⁽⁷⁰⁾

This last point is corroborated by our other sources. 'The spiritual cannot accept decay, no matter what actions it undertakes.'⁽⁷¹⁾ It is like gold placed in mud, or a pearl in mud.⁽⁷²⁾ The connection between this unchangeable nature and the salvation drama is made explicit in the De Resurrectione: 'The mind of those who have known him shall not perish. Therefore, we are elected to salvation and redemption, since we are predestined from the beginning not to fall into the foolishness of those who are without knowledge' (46.23 - 29). The whole drama is centred on the redemption of what must be redeemed, because it cannot suffer corruption.

To return to Heracleon: Jesus then tells the Samaritan woman to go and call her husband; but her true husband is 'her consort from the Pleroma' of whom she had up till that time been ignorant. 'The Samaritan woman had no husband in the world, for her husband was in the Aeon.'⁽⁷³⁾ When Heracleon interprets the statement of

69. Heracleon, Frag. 17.38 - 40.

70. See Foerster, Von. Val. zu Her., p. 16.

71. adv. haer. I vi 2; H. i 53 - 55.

72. ibid.; cf. Ev. Ph. para. 48; cf. 22.

73. Heracleon, Frag. 18.11 - 21.

Jesus: 'the hour is coming, when neither in this mountain nor in Jerusalem will you worship the Father' (Jn 4.21), he makes clear the three-fold division of substances and also the inclusion of the Samaritan woman among the pneumatics who worship the Father of Truth.⁽⁷⁴⁾ The Samaritan woman is acknowledged as a pneumatic. Heracleon's exegesis of John 4.24 is significant: 'God is spirit and they who worship him must worship him in spirit and truth.' This Heracleon understands as indicative that only those of the same nature as the Father can worship in truth.⁽⁷⁵⁾

Not only is the Samaritan woman the symbol of the pneumatic element, she is also the symbol of the elect pneumatics, i.e. of the Church, for 'the Church expects the Christ and is persuaded about him that he alone knows all things',⁽⁷⁶⁾ and at the same time 'the Samaritan woman was persuaded about the Christ that when he came he would proclaim all things'.⁽⁷⁷⁾ The climax of the process of redemption has been reached: Christ now tells the Samaritan woman that he himself is the one she had been expecting.⁽⁷⁸⁾ The pneumatic element is united with its consort from the Pleroma.⁽⁷⁹⁾ The identification of Christ as the awaited consort from the Pleroma makes

74. Heracleon, Frag. 20. 75. Heracleon, Frag. 24.

76. Heracleon, Frag. 25. 77. Heracleon, Frag. 26.

78. *ibid.*

79. That is, the pneumatic element in each Gnostic is united with its angelic counterpart which comes with the Saviour from the Aeon. Heracleon, Frag. 22; cf. 'When we were Hebrews, we were orphans and had (only) our mother, but when we became Christians we obtained a father and a mother' (*Ev. Ph.* para 6).

another point plain: the Samaritan woman is not only the Church of the elect pneumatics and the pneumatic element in general, she is also the Sophia of the system of Ptolemaeus who is formed according to existence by Christ and according to knowledge by the Saviour.⁽⁸⁰⁾ Once again we can see how discussion of the drama at one level may have echoes of the drama at another level.⁽⁸¹⁾

Further light is shed on the union of the Gnostic with his consort from the Pleroma by Theodotus. As we have seen, when he came the Saviour awoke the soul and kindled the spark with his effective word.⁽⁸²⁾ Once 'formed' by the Saviour the pneumatics become 'children of Man and the

80. Barth (op. cit., p. 77) rejects the interpretation of the Samaritan woman as Sophia, on the ground that Sophia was never ignorant of the true God. However, the real point is the teaching about the true worship of God and the true nature of God, and for this formation according to knowledge is a necessity for Sophia herself, for Achamoth and for the spiritual seed individually and collectively. The Samaritan woman represents all the aspects of the pneumatic nature in all its phases in its need of redemption. See Sagnard, La gnose val., pp. 501f. In the Gospel of Philip it is possible that Sophia is represented by Mary Magdalene (Ev. Ph. para. 32, 55; see Janssens, art. cit., Le Muséon 81(1968), pp. 91, 99).

81. This is not to suggest that there is in reality only one episode in the salvation drama that is repeated in a number of different ways. The salvation drama can be divided into episodes which reflect similarities and echoes, but together the episodes also make one single drama. See below, pp. 523 - 29.

82. See above, p. 458.

Bridal Chamber'.⁽⁸³⁾ In short, the formation by the Saviour establishes the relationship of the pneumatic, of the superior seed, to the male element and to the Pleroma itself, for from being a 'child of the female' the seed 'becomes male and a son of the bride-groom'.⁽⁸⁴⁾ The re-union of male and female is brought about, then, by the work of the Saviour, and the decisive point in the salvation drama is reached.⁽⁸⁵⁾ By a curious piece of imagery the fact that Jesus carries his cross becomes a sign of the entry of the pneumatics into the Pleroma with Jesus, for 'having carried the seeds on his shoulders, he led them into the Pleroma'.⁽⁸⁶⁾ The image changes, however, so that the concept of the seeds as the body of the Saviour returns: the seeds are the body, Jesus is the shoulders, Christ is the head. The idea is continued in what follows in the explanation of the phrase: 'Whoever does not take up his cross and follow me, is not my brother';⁽⁸⁷⁾ 'He (sc. Christ), therefore, raised the body of Jesus, which is consubstantial ($\delta\mu\omega\upsilon\sigma\iota\omicron\varsigma$) with the Church'.⁽⁸⁸⁾ Thus the head saves the entire body. The relationship of the pneumatics to the world of the Pleroma to which both Christ

83. Exc. ex Theod. 68.

84. Exc. ex Theod. 79; cf. Ev. Th. 114.

85. Cf. Ev. Th. 4; 16; 22; 23; 49; 75; 106.

86. Exc. ex Theod. 42.2.

87. Cf. Lk. 14.27 ('disciple' not 'brother'). Cf. Mt. 10. 38; 16.24; Mk 8.34; Lk. 9.23.

88. Exc. ex Theod. 42.3.

and Jesus belong is well illustrated in this passage: they are of the same substance. Of this 'resurrection' of the pneumatics the acts of Jesus in raising the dead are an image, for those so raised have to die again in the physical sense, therefore raising the dead is not evidence for a physical resurrection but for a spiritual one. (89)

Although there is nothing comparable in the treatise, De Resurrectione, to the idea of the union of the Gnostic with his consort from the Pleroma, there is a passage which Malcolm Peel has discussed under the heading 'unio mystica'. (90) Here the link between the redemptive event of Christ and the redemption of the individual Gnostic is made by the fact that the individual Gnostic participates in the death and resurrection of Christ: 'He (the Saviour) transformed himself into an imperishable Aeon and raised himself up, having swallowed the visible by the invisible, and He gave us the way of our immortality. Then indeed, as the Apostle said, "We suffered with him, and we arose with him, and we went to heaven with him."' (45.17 - 28). Despite apparent parallels with 'Pauline mysticism' this passage affirms only that Christ has made possible the resurrection of the elect. (91) The continuation of the passage links Christ and the believer a little more closely. (92) The believer, by having put on Christ, (93) is protected by Christ till death and is drawn to heaven by Christ 'like the beams by

89. Exc. ex Theod. 7.5.

90. Peel, op. cit., pp. 133 - 39.

91. Peel, op. cit., p. 138.

92. Puech and Quispel (art. cit. in VC 8(1954), pp. 43ff.

the sun' (45.28 - 46.2). In this way, then the drama moves from Christ to the believer and his resurrection and return to the Pleroma.

So far we have been concerned with the redemption of the pneumatic element. It will be remembered that in Ptolemaeus, Heracleon, the Tractatus Tripartitus and Marcus the psychics were regarded with some favour, and we must now consider their part in the redemption. Here again, the most light is shed by Heracleon. As a result of conversion, the pneumatic now becomes himself a bearer of the gospel, principally to the psychics.⁽⁹⁴⁾ Heracleon makes his clearest statements about the psychics in his exegesis of the pericope on the Ruler of the synagogue (Jn 4.46 - 54).⁽⁹⁵⁾ The Ruler is the Demiurge as is indicated by his 'small and temporal kingdom'; Capernaum,

92. (contd.) and in the Introduction to the editio princeps) maintain the consubstantiality of the believers with the Saviour, but, as Peel has shown (op. cit., pp. 138f.) this is to go a little further than the evidence will allow.
93. This is not necessarily to be understood as a reference to Baptism. Indeed, Baptism is never mentioned in the work. See Peel, op. cit., esp. pp. 135, 137; van Unnik, art. cit., in JEH 15(1964), p. 151.
94. The voice becomes Logos (Heracleon, Frag. 5.27f.); the Samaritan woman goes 'to proclaim the presence of Christ to the called (i.e. to the psychics)' (id. Frag. 27). Cf. id. Frag. 37; Ev. Ph. para. 110; Ev. Th. 24.
95. Heracleon, Frag. 40. Cf. Sagnard, La gnose val., pp. 515 - 18; Foerster, Von Val. zu Her., pp. 25 - 28; Barth, op. cit., pp. 80f.

near the sea, is the part of the Midst that is nearest to matter. The son of the Ruler of the synagogue is not in his right nature, but is in ignorance and sinfulness.

That is, the psychic nature is immersed in matter. The son is about to die; i.e. the psychic is capable of life or death according to its choice.⁽⁹⁶⁾ When Jesus suggests that unless the Ruler sees signs and wonders he will not believe, this indicates that he is addressing one who possesses a nature capable of being persuaded by works or feelings, though not capable of believing in the Logos. The psychic is therefore capable of salvation of a sort. The psychic, however, needs the Saviour, as is shown by the appeal to Jesus to come down before the Ruler's son dies. The Saviour is as necessary for the salvation of the psychic as for the salvation of the pneumatic.⁽⁹⁷⁾ So Jesus declares that his son will live, and the Ruler believes and his whole house. This Heracleon understands

96. Cf. id. Frag. 46.9ff. A similar point is made in Ptolemaeus: The psychics can earn their salvation by faith and good deeds (adv. haer. I vi 2; H. i 53 - 55) and by being separated from their passions by the Saviour (Exo. ex Theod. 61.3); and also in the Tractatus Tripartitus 119.20ff. (cited by Zandee in Numen 11(1964), pp. 50f.).

97. In fact, as Foerster points out, 'nur dem Psychischen gegenüber, das eine $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\theta\epsilon\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$ erfährt, ist von einem erlösenden Tun des Heilandes im eigentlichen Sinne die Rede' (art. cit., NTS 6(1959-60), p. 30).

to imply that the Saviour went down to Capernaum and healed the Ruler's son; the descent of the Saviour is an essential part of the salvation drama.⁽⁹⁸⁾ As a result of the healing, the Demiurge and all his angels believed. The Ruler's son was healed in the seventh hour, another indication that he is from the hebdomad and is therefore a psychic.

Further information about the Demiurge and his part in the salvation drama is given by Ptolemaeus. When the Saviour comes he teaches the Demiurge about everything and the Demiurge is overjoyed and yields to him with all his power.⁽⁹⁹⁾ Until the coming of the Saviour he had been in ignorance.⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ Having been instructed by the Saviour, the Demiurge continues to have a function. 'He accomplishes the dispensation in regard to the world (τὴν κατὰ τὸν κόσμον οἰκονομίαν) until the necessary moment of time.' In particular he does this because of his care and concern for the Church, and because he knows what his final destiny will be, to pass into the place of the Mother.⁽¹⁰¹⁾

Within the terms of the salvation drama, the concern expressed for the psychic by Ptolemaeus and Heracleon is quite gratuitous: the only thing which must be saved for

98. Cf. Heracleon, Frag. 11, 26, 28.

99. adv. haer. I vii 4; H. i 64.

100. adv. haer. I vii 1; H. i 59f.; I vii 4; H. i 63f.

101. adv. haer. I vii 4; H. i 64.

the salvation drama to be complete is the pneumatic. Even in Ptolemaeus and Heracleon, however, the principal concern is with the pneumatics, and in most of our other sources the concern is more or less exclusively for the pneumatics. Hence there is a strain of élitism in Valentinianism. This can be clearly seen in the Gospel of Truth. The revelation that is made is not an open revelation, for the Name, that is the Father's revelation of himself, is invisible, (102) 'it alone is the mystery of the invisible which enters the ears which are all filled with it; and indeed the name of the Father is not spoken, but it is revealed in a Son. Thus, then, it is a great name. Who, then can pronounce a name for him, the great name, but he alone whose name this is, and the sons of the name, those in whom the name of the Father was at rest and who, conversely, were themselves at rest in his name?' (103) The revelation is only for the sons of the name. In the work as a whole, too, attention is focused on the errant spiritual beings of the Father. It is stated negatively in the fact that the hylics are strangers to the Son and do not recognise him (31.1 - 4). It is also clear, however, from other contexts that those to whom the Redeemer comes are those related to him. The Word is called Saviour because he saves 'those who were unable to know the Father' (16.38 - 17.1), and the gospel is 'a discovery for those who were seeking him'. (104)

102. Cf. Valentinus, Frag. 5; Exc. ex Theod. 26.1.

103. Ev. Ver. 38.18 - 32; cf. Valentinus, Frag. 2; Hippolytus, Ref. V 36.2.

104. Ev. Ver. 17.3f.; cf. 18.11 - 13.

Those unable to know, and those seeking the Father are precisely those who came from him originally. So also, the gospel is revealed to the perfect (18.11 - 14), and the Word as a teacher in the school has only to confirm the little children 'to whom belongs the knowledge of the Father' (19.28 - 30). 'When the Truth made its appearance, all its emanations (?) recognised it' (26.27 - 29). The revelation is for an elite only; therefore, so too is redemption. (105)

The concept of a salvation drama seems to imply a smooth-running and steadily unfolding succession of events moving in clear progression from a start, through a climax to a conclusion. So far, the salvation drama which we have been examining has advanced in a logical and clearly connected manner. When the drama becomes attached to a single key figure or event (in this case Christ and the revelation he brings), an inevitable tension arises between the drama associated with this key figure and the drama as experienced by those who enter it at a later stage. For them, the decisive revelatory event is in the past, no matter how significant the moment at which they themselves came to know may be for them, and the final goal of the drama lies in the future. How then is the Gnostic related to the past and the future of the salvation drama? There is an additional tension as well between what, in the light of the revelation he has received, the Gnostic

105. Cf. Story, op. cit., p. 141. Cf. also De Res. 44.8 - 10; Ev. Th. 62.

now knows to be his true nature and destiny and the conditions under which he must continue to live until his physical death. These tensions lead us naturally to a consideration of what we may call the means of grace in the Valentinian salvation drama. There is, however, one other solution to the tension that can be observed in the treatise, De Resurrectione: what can be called Realized Eschatology.⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ Because the believer shares in the death and resurrection of Christ he is to regard himself as already dead and risen.⁽¹⁰⁷⁾ Nevertheless, as Malcolm Peel has observed, 'rare indeed is that mystical piety which can maintain a point of view in the face of daily confrontation with facts of experience which contradict it.'⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ There is also a consummation still to come in the De Resurrectione, but we shall return to that in our final section.

The Means of Grace.

In Valentinian Gnosticism the principal means of grace were the sacraments. Irenaeus reports some of the sacramental practices of the Marcosians,⁽¹⁰⁹⁾

106. See Peel, op. cit., pp. 139 - 43; cf. id., 'Gnostic Eschatology and the New Testament', in NT 12(1970), pp. 141 - 65; J. Zandee, 'De Opstanding in de Brief aan Rheginos en in het Evangelie van Philippus', in NTT 16(1961-62), pp. 361 - 77, esp. pp. 362 - 64.

107. De Res. 49.16 - 30; cf. Ev. Ph. para. 21; 63; 7; 90; 127; Ev. Th. 59.

108. Peel, op. cit., p. 143.

109. Principally in adv. haer. I xiii 2f., H. i 115 - 19; I xxi 2 - 5; H i 181 - 88.

and from Theodotus we learn something of his teaching on Baptism,⁽¹¹⁰⁾ but our major source of information is now the Gospel of Philip.⁽¹¹¹⁾ From all of these we can gain a relatively full picture of the part these sacraments played in relating the believer to the salvation drama. According to the Gospel of Philip 'the Lord did everything in a mystery, a baptism and a chrism and a eucharist and a redemption and a bride-chamber' (para. 68). Five sacraments are mentioned here,⁽¹¹²⁾ and we shall consider each in turn.

Baptism is, in the first place, a rebirth on a higher plane. Through birth one is born on the earthly material level; through rebirth one is made a partaker of the life that the Saviour brings from the Pleroma. So, according to Theodotus, the Powers of Fate govern generation,⁽¹¹³⁾ but Baptism means escape from the baneful influence of the planets, the evil powers.⁽¹¹⁴⁾ The escape from the

110. Principally in Exc. ex Theod. 76 - 83.

111. Studies of the whole sacramental system in the Gospel of Philip are to be found in the editions of Ménard (pp. 25 - 29) and Wilson (pp. 17 - 23). and also in separate discussions by E. Segelberg, 'The Coptic-Gnostic Gospel according to Philip and its sacramental system', in Numen 7(1960), pp. 189 - 200, and Zandee, art. cit., in NTT 16(1961-62), pp. 364 - 66.

Unfortunately, I have been unable to consult the dissertation by H.G. Gaffron, 'Studien zum koptischen Philippusevangelium unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Sakramente.'

112. According to Schenke's restoration of para. 60 of the Gospel of Philip there are seven mysteries.

113. Exc. ex Theod. 70 - 71, esp. 70.1. On this see also G.W.H. Lampe, The Seal of the Spirit, pp. 121f.

Powers means also the transition from death to life by Baptism.⁽¹¹⁵⁾ 'He whom Christ regenerates is transferred to life, to the Ogdoad. They die to the world, but live to God, so that death may be destroyed by death, and corruption by the resurrection.'⁽¹¹⁶⁾ Perhaps for the same reason the Gospel of Philip asserts that 'we go down indeed into the water, but we do not go down unto death.'⁽¹¹⁷⁾ Death is of this world, and Baptism is escape from this world. It is not death on a cross and resurrection from the grave that destroys death and corruption but death to and resurrection from life dominated by the Powers. It is consistent with this that Theodotus says 'the water, being exercised and become the baptism, not only separates off what is inferior, but also acquires sanctification.'⁽¹¹⁸⁾ Baptism too has no effect on the body, only on the soul.⁽¹¹⁹⁾ In Baptism one puts on 'the living man', that is, Christ who is from the Pleroma.⁽¹²⁰⁾

114. Exc. ex Theod. 76.2, 4; 77.3; 78.1; 80.3.

115. Exc. ex Theod. 77.1.

116. Exc. ex Theod. 80.1f.; cf. adv. haer. I xxi 3; H. i 183 - 85 (Marcosians).

117. Ev. Ph. para. 109; cf. 101 which seems to contain a reference to divesting oneself in Baptism.

118. Exc. ex Theod. 82.1f.

119. Exc. ex Theod. 77.2.

120. Ev. Ph. para. 101. See Ménard, L'Évangile selon Philippe, p. 18.

Baptism is also associated with the Name. There is a warning in the Gospel of Philip that it is not enough simply to receive the name, one must obtain it for oneself; merely to receive it is to have it as a loan that must be repaid.⁽¹²¹⁾ The point behind this is that baptism is an image of rebirth,⁽¹²²⁾ and rebirth is only for those who belong to the Pleroma, that is, for the pneumatics. This emerges clearly in Theodotus. Baptism is in the Name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.⁽¹²³⁾ The Name here means, as elsewhere in Theodotus, the Name that is the source and foundation of the Pleroma and of knowledge of the Father, Only-Begotten. In this Name, the angelic counterpart to the pneumatic has already been baptised. In this way the angelic counterpart possesses the Name, and the pneumatic in his baptism is also found in the Name, and will therefore, once united with his angel, not be prevented from entering the Pleroma by Limit.⁽¹²⁴⁾ Baptism in the Name is therefore intimately linked with the salvation drama. To bear the Name is to have the Name inscribed on one, to be sealed as belonging to the person named.⁽¹²⁵⁾

121. Ev. Ph. para. 67; cf. 59; adv. haer. I vi 4; H. i 56f.

122. See the comments of Wilson and Ménard to Ev. Ph. para. 67.

123. Exc. ex Theod. 76.3.f.; cf. Ev. Ph. para. 67; adv. haer. I xxi 3; H. i 183. In this last we read: the name of the unknown Father of all, into Truth the mother of all, into him who came down into Jesus, into Unity and Redemption and Fellowship with the powers.'

124. Exc. ex Theod. 22.4 - 6; cf. Ev. Ph. para. 74.

125. Exc. ex Theod. 80.3; 83; 86.2.

According to Theodotus, Baptism is by water and the Spirit, but a distinction is drawn between the work of the water and the Spirit. The water is effective for extinguishing the material fire which attacks all bodies, i.e. the fire that will destroy everything hylic, but to extinguish the immaterial fire of the demons, evil angels and the devil himself the Spirit is necessary.⁽¹²⁶⁾ It is clear from this that water-baptism by itself is not sufficient. A similar attitude can be discerned in the Gospel of Philip, but there the contrast is not between Baptism in water and Spirit, but between Baptism and Chrism. The Chrism is described as superior to Baptism on several occasions.⁽¹²⁷⁾ Baptism itself appears to be somewhat disparaged (para. 90). Yet Baptism and Chrism are closely related for it is said that 'it is fitting to baptise in the two, in light and water. But the light is the chrism.'⁽¹²⁸⁾ Fire is associated with the Chrism, but not the destructive fire as in Theodotus.⁽¹²⁹⁾ Christ is so named because of the chrism, and the believer is called a Christian because of the Chrism.⁽¹³⁰⁾ It is through the Chrism that the

126. Exc. ex Theod. 81.1; cf. 81.2f.

127. Ev. Ph. para. 95; cf. 25; 76. On anointing cf. also Ev. Ver. 36.13ff.

128. Ev. Ph. para. 75; But, as the same passage makes clear, you cannot see your reflection in water or mirror without light, nor is light by itself any use without water or a mirror.

129. Ev. Ph. para. 25.

130. Ev. Ph. para. 95; cf. para. 67 where it is said that he who obtains the name of the Father, Son and Spirit

believer has access to the salvation tradition for 'the Father anointed the Son, and the Son anointed the apostles, and the apostles anointed us.' (131)

Despite the unexpected historical line of tradition here in a Gnostic work, the important point is that the tradition is conveyed not by Baptism or ordination but by Chrism. 'He who is anointed possesses the All. He possesses the resurrection, the light, the Cross, the Holy Spirit.' (132)

It is through Chrism, then, rather than Baptism that the believer is taken up into the salvation drama. Nevertheless, as the Gospel of Philip makes quite clear, Baptism and Chrism are both surpassed by the Bride-chamber (para. 76).

We have rather less information about the Eucharist. Marcus clearly associates the Eucharist with the gift of grace from the Pleroma to fill the 'inner man'. (133) In the Gospel of Philip, the Eucharist, like Baptism, is associated with the shift from the old order of the material world to the new order of the Pleroma. It is said that 'the Eucharist is Jesus. For he is called in the Syrian Pharisatha, which is "the spread out". For Jesus came crucifying the world' (para. 53). The train of thought

130. (contd.) for himself in Chrism (instead of merely receiving it as a loan in Baptism) becomes not a Christian but a Christ. Cf. also Theophilus, ad Autol. I 12.

131. Ev. Ph. para. 95.

132. Ev. Ph. para. 95; cf. 75; 92; Exc. ex Theod. 81.1.

133. adv. haer. I xiii 2; H. i 115 - 17.

here becomes clear when it is observed that the Syrian word comes from a root meaning both 'to break (bread)' and 'to spread'.⁽¹³⁴⁾ This explains the connection between Jesus and the Eucharist at the linguistic level, and the connection between 'spread out' and crucifixion is probably to be found in the fact that, in the drama, the Christ of the Pleroma was 'spread out' on the cross to separate off the passions of Sophia.⁽¹³⁵⁾ Once again the crucifixion becomes a sign of the separating off of the lower self. If indeed this passage is a reference to the sacrament of the Eucharist,⁽¹³⁶⁾ then in the sacrament of the Eucharist the Gnostic must have seen an image of his own escape from the material sphere. A similar point appears to be made in paragraph 23 of the Gospel of Philip. It is impossible to rise in this material flesh for 'Flesh and blood shall not inherit the kingdom of God' (I Cor. 15.50). What will inherit is 'that which belongs to Jesus with his blood. Because of this he said: "He who shall not eat my flesh and drink my blood has no life in him" (Jn 6.53). A contrast is therefore drawn between material flesh and

134. See the comments in the editions of Wilson and Ménard, ad. loc. and W.C. van Unnik, 'Three Notes on the "Gospel of Philip"', in NTS 10(1963-64), pp. 465 - 69, see pp. 468f.

135. See Ménard, L'Évangile selon Philippe, pp. 169f.

136. Ménard points out that in the Gospel of Philip the Eucharist may refer either to the sacrament itself or to the grace that accompanies it (op. cit., pp. 168), and in para. 53 it is not entirely clear of which aspect the author was thinking.

blood and spiritual flesh and blood, which are the Logos and the Holy Spirit. 'He who has received these has food and drink and clothing.' 'It is necessary to rise in this flesh, in which everything exists.'⁽¹³⁷⁾ So again the Gnostic sees in the Eucharist a sign of his union with the Logos and the Holy Spirit, that with which he will be clothed when he has cast off this material flesh. A similar point is made in the Gospel of Philip when it is said that 'when Christ came, the perfect man, he brought bread from heaven in order that man might be nourished with the food of man' (para. 15) instead, that is, of with the food of beasts;⁽¹³⁸⁾ and more explicitly it is said that the eucharistic cup is 'full of the Holy Spirit, and it belongs to the wholly perfect man. When we drink this, we shall receive for ourselves the perfect man' (para. 100), that is Christ. The Eucharist then looks forward to the time when the Gnostic will be fully redeemed from the material world. A final reminder of this is the following: Jesus 'said on that day in the thanksgiving: "Thou who hast joined the perfect, the light, with the Holy Spirit, unite the angels with us also, the images' (para. 26). This at once recalls that the Saviour is to be united with

137. This is the interpretation offered by Wilson (ad. loc.), Ménard (ad loc.) and Janssens (art. cit., Le Muséon 81(1968), pp. 89f.).

138. cf. Ev. Ph. para. 84.

Sophia and the Gnostic with his angel.⁽¹³⁹⁾ Whether or not the reference to the thanksgiving (εὐχαριστία) is understood as a reference to the sacrament, or rather its institution, the idea of a symbolic anticipation of the eschatological reality in the Eucharist would accord well with what we have outlined above. In spite of its importance, the Eucharist is still surpassed by Redemption and the Bridal-chamber.⁽¹⁴⁰⁾

Nothing significant can be gleaned from the Gospel of Philip about the sacrament of Redemption,⁽¹⁴¹⁾ but Irenaeus's statements about the practices of the Marcosians may shed some light on the matter. Once again the sacrament is eschatologically orientated. It is to the pneumatics what water baptism is to the psychics and is performed with oil and water or balsam.⁽¹⁴²⁾ Its significance lies in that without it those who have attained to perfect knowledge cannot enter the Pleroma, for it is the Redemption which leads them down into the depths of Depth; it is for perfection.⁽¹⁴³⁾ A similar rite (or perhaps the same rite)⁽¹⁴⁴⁾

139. See above, pp. 396f., 483 - 87 ; below, pp. 508 - 11.

140. Ev. Ph. para. 98: 'So it is also with the bread and the cup and the oil, even if there be something else higher than these.' Ménard (ad loc.), Wilson (ad loc.) and Segelberg (art. cit., p. 195) all regard the 'oil' as referring to the sacrament of Redemption.

141. See Ménard, L'Évangile selon Philippe, p. 28; Wilson The Gospel of Philip, p. 18; Segelberg, art. cit., p. 197.

142. adv. haer. I xxi 2, 4; H. i 182, 185. Lampe, op. cit., pp. 124 - 30, associates this anointing with Chrism, as part of or an alternative to Baptism, rather than with some other sacrament such as Redemption.

143. adv. haer. I xxi 2; H. i 181f.

is administered to the dying along with the pass-words to be used in the presence of the Demiurge and his powers. These pass-words are a declaration of the Gnostic's heavenly origin and his return whence he came.⁽¹⁴⁵⁾ Thus the sacrament is a symbolic participation by the Gnostic in the salvation drama.

Finally we come to the Holy of Holies, the Bridal-Chamber.⁽¹⁴⁶⁾ We are not concerned here with the union of male and female, a theme to which we shall turn in our final section, but with the sacramental representation of such a union. In the first place there is the fact that the union of a man and woman is to be regarded as a sign of the mystery of the union above. Ptolemaeus seems to regard this as essential for the pneumatics so that they may attain the truth. The psychics, however, must practise continence, for their union on the physical level is not a sign of a higher truth, but merely lust.⁽¹⁴⁷⁾ True marriage, then, is to be

144. In both cases persons are anointed on the head with oil and water or balsam. The rite administered to the dying is not actually called Redemption but Irenaeus introduces the section with the phrase: 'alii . . . mortuos redimunt.'

145. adv. haer. I xxi 5; H. i 186 - 88.

146. Ev. Ph. para. 76; cf. para. 125 where the Bridal Chamber is described not as $\pi\epsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\varsigma \tilde{\eta}\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ (para. 76; Ménard's restoration) but as $\pi\epsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\varsigma \zeta\tilde{\eta} \pi\epsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\varsigma$. On this sacrament, in addition to the general studies on the sacraments, see R.M. Grant, 'The Mystery of Marriage in the Gospel of Philip', in After the New Testament, pp. 183 - 94, and Zandee, art. cit., NTT 16(1961-62), pp. 369f.

contrasted with false marriage. True marriage is only for the pneumatics. As the Gospel of Philip makes clear, the Bridal-Chamber is not for beasts but for free men and virgins (para. 73). Or again, the only ones allowed to enter the Bridal-Chamber are those related to the bride and groom (para. 122). True marriage is a mystery and is hidden. It is hidden from all but the privileged, and even for them the true reality is reserved for the Pleroma.

The Bridal-Chamber as a sacrament derives its meaning entirely from the fact that the Pleroma itself is described as the Bridal-Chamber.⁽¹⁴⁸⁾ Consequently the rite is to be understood as 'a spiritual marriage after the likeness of the unions above.'⁽¹⁴⁹⁾ It is a sign of union, or rather of re-union. 'Eve separated from Adam, because she was not united with him in the bridal chamber,' but 'those who have united in the bridal chamber will no longer be separated.'⁽¹⁵⁰⁾

Whether or not the bridal chamber here refers to the sacramental rite or to the eventual union in the Pleroma is not clear, but in any case the author of the Gospel of Philip claims to be able to see beyond the types and images: 'Because of this the perfect things are open to us, and the hidden things of the truth; and the holy things of the holy ones are revealed, and the bridal chamber invites us in'

147. adv. haer. I vi 4; H. i 57; cf. Grant, art. cit.,
After the N.T., pp. 187f.

148. See below, 508ff.

149. adv. haer. I xxi 3; H. i 183; cf. Ev. Ph. para. 103;
 124.

150. Ev. Ph. para. 79.

(para. 125). The 'invitation' of the bridal chamber points to the fact that the relationship between the image and the reality is not simply a static one, but of movement from the one to the other. Indeed, through the image grace is conferred. (151)

All these sacraments are orientated towards the eschatology of the salvation drama. Through them the Gnostic does not share in what has happened so much as taste beforehand in types and images what will be his lot hereafter. By means of the sacraments he anticipates his share in the final goal and acclaims the completion of the salvation drama. One notes also the Christocentricity especially of Baptism and the Eucharist. It would be a mistake to regard the sacraments as a necessary part of the Valentinian salvation drama. Even in the Gospel of Philip, in which so much is said about the sacraments, it is also said that 'the holy man is holy altogether, down to his body. For if he has received the bread he will make it holy, or the cup, or anything else that he receives, purifying them.' (152) The Gnostic is superior to the sacraments he receives. The sacraments are, then, merely

151. adv. haer. I xiii 3; H. i 118f.

152. Ev. Ph. para. 108. This one passage must be seen in perspective in the obvious importance that attaches to the sacraments in the Gospel of Philip, and Janssens has suggested that the holy man is in fact Christ, the one who gives the sacraments their meaning and their true significance as effective means of grace (art. cit., Le Muséon 81(1968), p. 118).

signs of a salvation he has on quite other grounds, they are not strictly the means of salvation. That this is so is borne out by the fact that some Valentinians rejected sacraments completely. Ptolemaeus and Heracleon say nothing about the sacraments.⁽¹⁵³⁾ Indeed, the rejection of all sacramental rites is the only logical outcome of a system in which knowledge brings redemption. The fact that not all the Valentinians took this step simply attests the fact that religious systems answer men's needs which are not always logical either. The logical rejection of all sacraments is concisely expressed in what Hans Jonas calls the 'pneumatic equation': 'Perfect salvation is the knowledge itself of the ineffable Greatness: for since both Defect and Passion came about through Ignorance, the whole system springing from Ignorance is dissolved by knowledge. Therefore knowledge is salvation of the inner man; . . . so that knowledge of universal being is sufficient for us.'⁽¹⁵⁴⁾

153. Nevertheless, Ptolemaeus does see the union of a man and a woman as a sign of grace for the pneumatics, and indeed appears to regard the physical union as an essential sign of the spiritual union: 'Whoever is "in the world" and does not love a woman so that he unites with her is not "of the truth" and will not attain the truth; but he who is from the world and unites with a woman will not attain the truth because he lustfully unites with the woman' (adv. haer. I vi 4; H. i 57).

154. adv. haer. I xxi 4; H. i 186. See Hans Jonas, The Gnostic Religion, pp. 174 - 76.

V. THE CONSUMMATION

The salvation drama now draws to its conclusion. According to the system of Ptolemaeus the consummation will take place 'when all the pneumatic has been fashioned and perfected by knowledge.'⁽¹⁾ The timing of this is important, for, as himself part of the spiritual substance, the pneumatic is an essential part of the restoration of the Pleroma. Theodotus in fact notes that the Saviour descended from the Pleroma to gather all the seeds that constitute the body of Christ in order to lead them into the Pleroma.⁽²⁾ The Marcosians delivered to those about to die the pass-words⁽³⁾ that would take them safely past the Demiurge and his powers, but in the Gospel of Philip the Gnostic is rendered invisible to the powers because he has put on the perfect light.⁽⁴⁾ In Theodotus the Saviour sits beside the Demiurge, subduing him and allowing the seeds to pass upwards to the Pleroma.⁽⁵⁾

Both the Gospel of Philip and the treatise De Resurrectione speak of a resurrection, but there is no doubt that a spiritual resurrection is meant.⁽⁶⁾ According to the De

1. adv. haer. I vi 1; H. i 53; cf. Exc. ex Theod. 67.3.

2. Exc. ex Theod. 26.2f.; 42.2.

3. adv. haer. I xxi 5; H. i 186 - 88.

4. Ev. Ph. para. 77; cf. 106; 127.

5. Exc. ex Theod. 38.3.

6. See Zandee, art. cit., Numen 11(1964), pp. 69f.; id., art. cit., NTT 16(1961-62), 361 - 77; cf. Peel, art. cit., NT 12(1970), pp. 141 - 65.

Resurrectione the believers are drawn to heaven by the Saviour in the same way that beams are drawn by the sun: 'this is the spiritual resurrection which swallows up the psychic alike with the other fleshly' (45.19 - 46.2). At another point it states: 'Let no one be given cause to doubt concerning this, . . . indeed, the visible members which are dead shall not be saved, (only) the living (members) which exist within them would arise. Then, what is the resurrection? It is always the disclosure of those who have arisen' (47.36 - 48.6). It is then a spiritual resurrection; but one must possess it now in order to be able to receive it later.⁽⁷⁾ The same points arise from the Gospel of Philip: 'While we are in this world it is fitting for us to acquire for ourselves the resurrection, in order that when we strip off the flesh we may be found in Rest and not walk in the Midst.'⁽⁸⁾ Both works also speak of a resurrection of the flesh; but this too is not material but spiritual flesh. The author of the De Resurrectione speaks of putting on flesh when coming into the world, although one had previously been without flesh. One is therefore to expect to receive flesh on ascending into the Aeon.⁽⁹⁾ This can only mean spiritual flesh.⁽¹⁰⁾

7. See the refs. above, p. 493, n. 107.

8. Ev.Ph. para. 63; cf. 21; 67; 90; 127.

9. De Res. 47.4 - 8; cf. 47.38 - 48.3.

10. See Peel, op. cit., p. 148; cf. Zandee, art. cit., NTT 16(1961-62), pp. 370 - 73.

The Gospel of Philip more clearly contrasts the material flesh which cannot rise with the flesh of Jesus, the true flesh, which the believer puts on in the Eucharist (symbolically) and in the resurrection (truly).⁽¹¹⁾

Ptolemaeus maintains that immediately prior to the consummation, the pneumatics have their repose (*ἀνάπαυσις*) with the Mother in the Ogdoad (i.e., the Midst)⁽¹²⁾ on the Lord's Day (i.e. the eighth day, the ogdoad). There, their souls, thought of as their wedding garments, are kept by the Mother until the end.⁽¹³⁾ The other faithful souls are with the Demiurge, at whose right hand is seated the psychic Christ.⁽¹⁴⁾ In our other sources, the repose is associated with the Pleroma itself.⁽¹⁵⁾

When the end comes Sophia-Achamoth will leave her place, the place of the Midst, and will pass into the Pleroma to become the spouse of the Saviour, thus making another syzygy.⁽¹⁶⁾ The Pleroma is frequently described as

11. Ev. Ph. para. 23; cf. 101; according to Theodotus the total of the elect pneumatics make up the body of Christ; they are his flesh (Exc. ex Theod. 1.1).

12. On the Midst, see below, p. 512.

13. Cf. Asc. Is. 8.14, 26; 9.9 - 11, 24 - 26.

14. Exc. ex Theod. 62.1; 63.1f.

15. See below n. 29.

16. There are, then, three stages in the development of the spiritual seed and of Sophia herself. There is formation according to existence, formation according to knowledge, and finally union in syzygy. See Foerster, art. cit., NTS 6(1959-60), pp. 19f. Exc. ex Theod. 34.2; Ev. Ph. para. 6; 26 (and, if Janssens is correct in identifying Mary Magdalene as Sophia, 32; 55).

a Bridal-chamber.⁽¹⁷⁾ The union, or rather re-union, of the pneumatic element with its angelic counter-part follows. This is described in slightly different ways by our various sources. According to Ptolemaeus, the pneumatics were sown by Ahamoth in righteous souls up until the end. In the lower world they were educated and nurtured, having been sent forth as babies. In the consummation they become worthy of perfection,⁽¹⁸⁾ and, divesting themselves of their souls, become spirits of pure reason (πνεύματα νοερά). They enter the Pleroma and become spouses of the angels of the Saviour.⁽¹⁹⁾

According to Theodotus, when the Saviour has gathered all the seeds that constitute the body of Christ, the female seeds, that is the pneumatics, become male in their union with the angels of the Saviour, and the essential unity is restored.⁽²⁰⁾ The pneumatic, because he possesses the Name of God and the image of the Spirit is in no danger of being excluded from the Pleroma by Limit;⁽²¹⁾ being part of the body of Christ he may enter the pleroma through the door, which is the Saviour.⁽²²⁾

17. Heracleon, Frag. 12; Exc. ex Theod. 68; Ev. Ph. para. 61; 67; 76; 79; 87; 95; adv. haer. I vii 1; H. i 58f.

18. adv. haer. I vii 5; H. i 65.

19. adv. haer. I vii 1; H. i 59; cf. Heracleon, Frag. 26; 35.

20. Exc. ex Theod. 21.3; 22.3; 35.3f.; 36; 68; 79.

21. Exc. ex Theod. 22.4; 86.1.

22. Exc. ex Theod. 26.2.

As may be expected, the Gospel of Philip sheds quite a lot of light on this union of the pneumatic with his angel. It is expressed in terms of the union of the image with the angel;⁽²³⁾ and also of the union of bride and groom.⁽²⁴⁾ It is also expressed in terms of putting on a garment, or putting on the perfect man, or the perfect light.⁽²⁵⁾ This leads us to an essential point that the Gospel of Philip makes abundantly clear: this union with the angelic counter-part is the discovery of one's true nature, a union with that which is my real self, a genuine becoming who I really am.⁽²⁶⁾ This can be seen in the fact that on the spiritual level a man becomes like the object he sees: 'It is not possible for any to see anything of those that are established unless he becomes like them. . . . But thou didst see something of that place and thou didst become these: Thou didst see the Spirit, thou didst become spirit. Thou didst see Christ, thou didst become Christ. Thou didst see the Father, thou shalt become Father' (para. 44). And in another passage

23. Ev. Ph. para. 21; 61; 67; 87.

24. Ev. Ph. para. 61; 74; 79; 87; 103; 122; 126. See also Ménard, op. cit., p. 14.

25. Ev. Ph. para. 24; 77; 101; 106.

26. Ev. Ph. para. 105: 'Some indeed, if they do not know themselves, will not enjoy what they possess, but those who have come to know themselves will enjoy them.'
Cf. 'Whoever knows the All but fails (to know) himself lacks everything' (Ev. Th. 67; cf. 3).

we read: 'If thou become man the man will love thee. If thou become spirit the spirit will be joined to thee. If thou become logos, it is the logos which will mix with thee. If thou become light, it is the light which will consort with thee. If thou become one of those who belong above, those who belong above will find their rest in thee.' (27)

With the entry of the spiritual element into the Pleroma there comes about the restoration, the Apocatastasis. (28) The spiritual element which took its origin from the Father, but through the fall of Sophia was subjected to an existence in matter, now returns to its place of origin. In the Pleroma it receives its rest (29) and the vision of the Father. (30) Even more than that, he who sees the Father will become Father, that is, will become one with him. (31)

At the consummation the Demiurge moves up to the

27. Ev. Ph. para. 113; cf. 13; 106; 123.

28. Heracleon, Frag. 34; adv. haer. I xiv 1; H. i 130f.; De Res. 44.30 - 33; Ev. Ph. para. 67; Trac. Trip. 117.18ff.; 123.6ff.; 128.13ff. (cited by Zandee, art. cit., Numen 11(1964), p. 67); Ev. Th. 18.

29. Heracleon, Frag. 12; Ev. Ph. para. 63; 82; 86; 118; Ev. Ver. 24.20; 41.12 - 14; cf. De Res. 43.34 - 44.3, where the rest is already received; cf. Ev. Th. 51.

30. Exc. ex Theod. 64. The ms. reads τὴν τοῦ πνεύματος (πνς) ὅψιν. The emendation of Stählin to πατρός (πρς) is accepted by both Casey and Sagnard. Cf. Ev. Ph. para. 27.

31. Ev. Ph. para. 44.

place of the Mother (Achamoth), the place of the Midst.⁽³²⁾

In Ptolemaeus and Heracleon, who regard the psychics with some favour, it is clear that the place of the Midst represents a place of salvation, but in the Gospel of Philip the Midst is regarded as the truly evil place, the place for the imperfect.⁽³³⁾ The reason for the horror with which the Midst is regarded here is probably to be found in the Gnostic's estimate of himself as part of the spiritual élite: therefore to fail to enter the Pleroma is the ultimate disaster; to reach a mere secondary level of salvation may be fitting for the psychics, but for the pneumatics it is unthinkable.⁽³⁴⁾ With the Demiurge are the psychics, and, as may be expected, Ptolemaeus and Heracleon have most to say about the salvation achieved by the psychics. From Ptolemaeus we learn that the psychics are capable of either salvation or damnation depending on their actions. If their actions are good they will go with the Demiurge into the place of the Midst, will receive rest, and will rejoice in the marriage feast of the pneumatics and their angels, though outside the Pleroma

32. adv. haer. I vii 1; H. i 59; I vii 4; H. i 64; Exc. ex Theod. 63.2; 34.2; Heracleon, Frag. 5 (Just as the voice becomes Logos, so the echo, i.e. the psychic, becomes voice); Frag. 13.9 - 12; Ev. Ph. para. 125.

33. Ev. Ph. para. 63; 107; cf. Ev. Ver. 17.33 - 35.

34. See the comments of Wilson, The Gospel of Philip, p. 124; cf. Ev. Ph. para. 4.

and not themselves part of the feast.⁽³⁵⁾ If their actions are bad they will perish along with the hylics.⁽³⁶⁾ The free-will of the psychics is only an apparent free-will, for the souls are in two categories, those good by nature and those evil by nature; the former are capable of receiving the spiritual seed, and will therefore pass into the place of the Midst when the pneumatic passes into the Pleroma; the latter are quite incapable of receiving the spiritual seed at all and will therefore perish.⁽³⁷⁾

35. Exc. ex Theod. 65. The passage is an exegesis of the pericope of the Wedding at Cana (Jn 2.1 - 11). One's first instinct is to identify the Ruler of the Feast (loc. cit.) with Christ, and hence Casey (op. cit. p. 25) is obliged to reckon with a final division of the Saviour into Christ and Jesus. As Sagnard has shown, however (La gnose val., pp. 536f.), the Ruler of the Feast is in fact the Demiurge. The Ruler of the feast in Jn 2.9 is no more than a Master of Ceremonies, and here the Demiurge and the psychics may listen to the rejoicing from outside the Pleroma, but may not enter. Like the working classes, they know their place! Cf. Trac. Trip. 118.27ff. (cited by Zandee, art. cit., Numen 11(1964), p. 50).

36. adv. haer. I vii 5; H. i 65f.; cf. I vii 1; H. i 59. See also Zandee, art. cit., Numen 11(1964), pp. 49 - 52.

37. ibid. These passages raise a problem to which our sources for Ptolemaeus provide no satisfactory answer. The psychics are said to possess free-will, and yet the spiritual seed is sown only in righteous souls. Foerster is possibly right in maintaining that Ptolemaeus had probably not resolved the problem (art. cit., NTS 6(1959-60), p. 28; cf. id., Von Val. zu Her., pp. 64f.).

Heracleon's attitude to the final destiny of the psychics can be discerned from his comments on the end of the pericope on the Samaritan woman in John 4. When the Samaritan woman, who is pneumatic, calls the Samaritans, who are psychic,⁽³⁸⁾ they implore the Saviour to stay with them, and he stays for two days. He is with them, but not of them.⁽³⁹⁾ During this time he converts many, and then departs, presumably to enter the Pleroma with the pneumatics.⁽⁴⁰⁾ The Samaritans (i.e. the psychics) are brought to belief first by the pneumatics, but then, on hearing the Saviour, believe for themselves.⁽⁴¹⁾ It is significant that Heracleon says that the Son of the Ruler of the synagogue (psychic) is 'not in his right nature', and that, even if he cannot believe in the Logos, nevertheless possesses a nature capable of being persuaded.⁽⁴²⁾

38. Heracleon, Frag. 37.

39. Heracleon, Frag. 38; $\pi\alpha\rho'$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ not $\xi\nu$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$.

40. See Sagnard, La gnose val., p. 519; Foerster, Von Val. zu Her., pp. 35f.

41. Heracleon, Frag. 39.

42. Janssens regards the final destiny of the psychics as admission to the Pleroma (art. cit., Le Muséeon 72(1959), pp. 131, 140, 143, 280f.), which is quite erroneous. The argument rests on three false premises. (1) That the bestowal of the seed makes man pneumatic (p. 280). The seed is pneumatic and is in the psychic as in a garment (cf. John the Baptist, see above, p. 418). (2) That when the Saviour comes he bestows the seed on the son of the Demiurge (Frag. 40 - p. 280). The fact that the son of the Demiurge is 'apt for salvation' does

For the hylics there is no hope. They are consubstantial with the devil, and of a different substance from the psychics and pneumatics; ⁽⁴³⁾ they are evil and will perish in Gehenna. ⁽⁴⁴⁾ According to Heracleon there are, strictly speaking, no men hylie by nature, but the psychics are capable of becoming sons of the devil by adoption if they follow his desires. ⁽⁴⁵⁾ This is in agreement with what Ptolemaeus says about those psychics who perform evil actions; but he adds that they will perish with the hylics; that is, Ptolemaeus regards some men as by nature hylie. ⁽⁴⁶⁾ These all will be destroyed with the material universe, which will be consumed by fire. ⁽⁴⁷⁾ Thus, each order

42. (contd.) not mean more than that he is apt for a psychic salvation, and it is nowhere stated that the Saviour gives him the seed. (3) That 'rest' necessarily means rest in the Pleroma (p. 143). This conclusion is reached by a misunderstanding of Frag. 13.1 - 12, that the psychics have already attained salvation outside the Pleroma before the Saviour comes (p. 131), and consequently must proceed from faith in that station to rest in the Pleroma if the Saviour is to do anything for them at all. In Frag. 13 the coming of the Saviour and its effect are viewed together, and the rest to which the psychics proceed (Frag. 32 - p. 143) is rest in the Midst. In short the psychics 'are unable to believe in the Logos' (Heracleon, Frag. 40.23).

43. Heracleon, Frag. 44; cf. 45; 46 passim; 47.

44. Heracleon, Frag. 18.24; 23; 46. 23f.

45. Heracleon, Frag. 46.9 - 28, 36 - 38.

46. adv. haer. I vii 5; H. i 65f.; cf. I vii 1; H. i 59.

47. Exc. ex Theod. 81.1; cf. Ev. Ph. para. 123; Ev. Ver. 25.12 - 19.

returns to its original state.⁽⁴⁸⁾ The hylic is a phantasy and returns to nothing;⁽⁴⁹⁾ the psychic begins and ends outside the Pleroma; only the pneumatic has its origin and its end within the Pleroma.

We have had little to say in this final section about the Gospel of Truth. This is partly because there is no clear-cut description of the consummation in the work; partly because the end is inherent in what has been said in the section on redemption; but mainly because at the end of the Gospel of Truth there is an eloquent account of the state of the spiritual beings who came from the Father and through knowledge returned to him, finding themselves in him all the time, when they reach their goal. In this paragraph many of the themes of the consummation are expressed:

'Such are they who possess from above something of this immeasurable greatness, as they strain towards that unique and perfect one who exists there for them. And they do not go down to Hades. They have neither envy nor moaning, nor is death in them. But they rest in him who rests, without wearying themselves or becoming involved in the search for truth. But they, indeed, are the truth, and the Father is in them, and they are in the Father, since they are perfect, inseparable from him who is truly good. They lack nothing in any way, but they are given rest and are refreshed by the Spirit. And they listen to their root; they have leisure for themselves, they in whom he will find his root, and he will suffer no loss to his soul. Such is the place of the blessed; this is their place' (42.11 - 38).

48. Ev. Ph. para. 10; Ev. Ver. 41.3 - 8.

49. Trac. Trip. 78.35 - 79.4.

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE CHALLENGE OF VALENTINIANISM.

We must now draw together the threads of this whole section in a way that will show clearly the challenge posed by Valentinian Gnosticism to the rest of the Church. Because of some special problems associated with it, we shall leave aside for the moment the Gospel of Truth. In our other sources the salvation drama shows a number of characteristic differences. For our present purpose some of the differences are of no importance,⁽¹⁾ but some of them show basic variations in the structure of the drama. There are a number of points associated with the origin of Christ, within the Pleroma in Ptolemaeus and Heracleon, outside the Pleroma in Valentinus, Theodotus, Marcus and the Tractatus Tripartitus. In the first place the different origin itself points to a different attitude to Christ in West and East. In the West Christ is emanated within the Pleroma along with the Holy Spirit and by nature and origin shares the life of the Pleroma, even to the extent of giving to the Pleroma the formation according to knowledge after the restoration of Sophia. In the Eastern version, while the entry of Christ into the Pleroma brings about the same result as in the Western version, that is, the peace of the Pleroma and the emanation of the Saviour, he nevertheless enters the Pleroma from outside as the first-fruits of

1. As, for example, the variation in names, in the origin of the Cosmocrator, etc.

those things outside the Pleroma; he is adopted into the Pleroma because of his natural affinity with it. There is in the Eastern form of the account a suggestion of what in another context would be called subordination.

Associated with the distinction in regard to the origin of Christ there is a distinction in regard to both Sophia and Limit. If Christ enters the Pleroma from outside, then the prior expulsion of the Aeon Sophia herself from the Pleroma is not surprising, and in Valentinus himself and in the Tractatus Tripartitus it does seem to be the case that Sophia is excluded from the Pleroma because of her fall. In Ptolemaeus and Heracleon, the origin of Christ within the Pleroma obviates any necessity for Sophia to bring about the lower world. Thus there is an upper and a lower Sophia (Achamoth) in the Western tradition and in the Gospel of Philip. In Theodotus, although Christ rises into the Pleroma, it is by no means certain whether there is one Sophia or two Sophias. In Marcus there are clearly two Sophias and Christ stems from the Mother outside the Pleroma. It is difficult to determine in which direction the change was being made, whether by the development of the Sophia myth or by the pressure of the Christology.⁽²⁾ If the Sophia myth is

2. G.C. Stead (art. cit., in JTS n.s. 20(1969), pp. 75 - 104) considers that 'the myth of Sophia has been deliberately reconstructed in two stages in order to accommodate inconsistencies in the earlier tradition' (p. 84). Among the inconsistencies Stead does not give any importance to the different origin of Christ as a factor influencing the reduplication.

primary then Marcus may represent an intermediate stage between Valentinus and Ptolemaeus, in that Sophia has been divided but Christ still comes from outside into the Pleroma; if the Christology is primary then Marcus represents a partial development with 'archaic' features. It may even be that the two changes are not directly connected. In the case of Limit something analogous seems to be the case. In the Eastern tradition Limit has the simple function of separating the Pleroma from all that is outside. In the Tractatus Tripartitus Limit is not even a separate hypostasis. In Ptolemaeus it is Limit who restores Sophia and separates off her Intention and Passion, an action that leads to Christ's going out of the Pleroma to give formation according to substance to the Passion of Sophia (that is, to Achamoth).

Another major difference between Eastern and Western forms of Valentinianism concerns the attitude to the psychics. The difference may be observed at a number of points. In Theodotus little interest is taken in the psychics. In the Gospel of Philip, their final resting place, the Midst, is regarded with horror. Yet in Ptolemaeus and Heracleon the good fortune of the psychics in attaining the place of the Midst and being able to overhear the rejoicing in the Bridal-chamber is emphasised. The Demiurge himself, who is a hostile figure in Theodotus and Valentinus (as are the archons in the Gospel of Philip), is given a place in the economy of salvation by Ptolemaeus and is favourably regarded in Heracleon and the Tractatus Tripartitus. He may

work in ignorance, and sow the spiritual seed without knowing what he is doing, but he welcomes the coming of the Saviour and eventually rejoices as the friend of the bridegroom.⁽³⁾ Consequently the words of the prophets, who come from the Demiurge, are not rejected out of hand by Ptolemaeus, for in them, or rather in some of them, is to be discerned the activity of the Spirit. In both East and West the Church consists of the called and the elect. In the East, both groups are pneumatic; the elect are the angelic male counterparts of the superior seed, who constitute the called. On the other hand, in Ptolemaeus and Heracleon the elect are the pneumatics and the called are the psychics. While the idea of the union of the Gnostic with his angel figures in our other sources, notably the Gospel of Philip, it is not presented in quite the same terms.

A similar distinction between East and West may be made in connection with the Christologies of the respective groups, and this is the original ground for the distinction of the groups. In Theodotus, emphasis is given to the idea of the spiritual seed as the body of Christ. The presence of the psychic element in Jesus must be discerned by implication, for it is not asserted out-right. On the other hand, for Ptolemaeus and Heracleon one of the four elements of the Saviour when on earth is the psychic Christ from the Demiurge, and there is also the psychic body of the dispensation. Then again, in the De Resurrectione and

3. Cf. 'En fin de compte, le D miurge sera content de son

the Gospel of Philip, and also in the Gospel of Truth, the classic distinction of East and West in Valentinianism is not clear, and indeed, while all the Valentinian sources display a docetic Christology to the extent that the Saviour never more than uses some kind of body and is never incarnate in the full sense of the word, these last mentioned works are less docetic than the other works in that the body used by the Saviour may be a physical body.

When all the above points are taken into account, there seems little doubt but that the Western school of Valentinian Gnosticism had a far more conciliatory and sympathetic attitude to the wider Church than did the Eastern school, who, by comparison, seem severely élitist. Ptolemaeus, Heracleon, and the author of the Tractatus Tripartitus (so far as we can judge at present) appear to have made a conscious effort to integrate the psychics into the salvation drama.⁽⁴⁾

Behind all our sources of Valentinianism there is clearly a Christocentric salvation drama. What now remains to be shown is that precisely as a salvation drama Valentinian Gnosticism presented a threat to those who opposed it and demanded something more than ridicule or simple insistence on tradition. The threat lies in the very fact that the salvation drama of Valentinian Gnosticism

3. (contd.) sort' (Sagnard, La gnose val., p. 264).

4. See Foerster, art. cit., in NTS 6(1959 - 60), p. 31.

presented a coherent and complete system whose primary focus was salvation achieved in a fundamentally Christocentric movement towards a well-defined goal. This demands closer examination.

That the system is coherent and comprehensive cannot be denied. The events of the salvation drama follow one another in dependent succession; the beginning and the end are both kept in view and there is a steady movement from one to the other. Between these two ends of the drama all else has its appointed place; there are few loose ends.⁽⁵⁾ As we have noted above, some Valentinians even integrated the psychics into the system and gave them a positive value. To that extent the system of Ptolemaeus is more complete than, say, that of Theodotus, in which the psychics have a very minor role, even though their ultimate destiny is the same as in the system of Ptolemaeus. Only the hylic remains without ultimate purpose; but then it came into being from nothing and therefore returns to nothing.

While the manner in which the drama has been presented here shows clearly the start and finish and the route taken, the real centre of gravity has been in some danger of being

5. Cf. 'Es lassen sich mit leichter Mühe die meisten Bausteine, mit denen dieses System des Ptolemaeus gebaut ist, nach ihrer Herkunft und weiteren Verwendung sondern. Dass aber mit ihnen ein sehr geschlossenes System von originaler Art und grosser Geschlossenheit erbaut ist, sollte nicht übersehen werden' (Foerster, art. cit., NTS 6(1959-60), p. 31).

obsoured. The heart of the system is neither the beginning in the Pleroma nor the end back in the Pleroma-become-Bridal-chamber; the heart is in the middle of the system, the salvation of the initiated Gnostic himself.⁽⁶⁾ The drama is designed to tell the Gnostic who he is. That this entails the recounting of the whole drama from beginning to end only underlines the fact that the key to who the Gnostic is lies in what he was and what he shall become. Above all, the drama tells him where he is now; it gives him the security of being able to plot his position, so to speak. It tells him in clear and certain terms that he is saved. Furthermore, the whole drama conveys this message because in each successive stage of the drama the Gnostic can see his own redemption represented. The central event at each stage is the formation according to knowledge, and this the Gnostic can see taking place in the Pleroma, with Ahamoth in the Midst, and with himself. But this formation according to knowledge is not the end of the process of redemption but is set in the course of a movement that we must now examine.

On one level the movement of the drama may be regarded as a succession of events leading from the primal Father back to the primal Father. This drama takes place in three acts, and in each act, in the Pleroma, in the Midst and in the lower world, we can see at work the process by which the movement is advanced. The process is described by

6. See in particular Sagnard, La gnose val., pp. 570 - 74.

Sagnard as the 'mécanisme' of Gnosticism.⁽⁷⁾ Sagnard sees in this process seven elements. (1) There is the primal Father who is infinite and unknown, and therein lies the instigation for the movement, for (2) the very fact that the primal Father is infinite and unknown brings about a tendency or striving towards him and at the same time (3) complete ignorance of the primal Father. (4) This leads to 'passion', because of the inherent conflict in the striving and the ignorance. (5) The passion is healed by the communication of knowledge, (6) by purification through the separating off of the passions, which leads (7) to peace and repose and final joy in the upper world. Sagnard then shows how this process works in each of the four areas of the Aeons, Sophia, Achamoth and the Gnostic.⁽⁸⁾ The details do not matter here. What is important is that through this 'mécanisme' the whole drama advances. Although in many respects each stage of the drama shows the various elements of the 'mécanisme' it would be a mistake to regard the whole drama as a series of repetitions at different levels. The drama as a whole advances also, and there are one or two elements that do not readily fit into a pattern of repetition. Thus, the repose of the Aeons is not the end of the process for they bring forth the Saviour who is to work on Achamoth in the intermediate stage. When

7. La gnose val., pp. 255 - 65.

8. ibid., pp. 258 - 65.

Achamoth is formed according to knowledge, purified of her passions, and given rest, she brings forth the pneumatic seeds which will entail the descent of the Saviour into the lower world. In fact, it must be remembered, as Foerster has pointed out, that it is not formation according to knowledge that is the final stage of the drama, but the achievement of syzygy,⁽⁹⁾ and this is reached for Achamoth and the spiritual seed only in the consummation. Taken as a whole the drama is not simply a three-fold re-enactment of the same events.

The 'mécanisme' underlines another point about the drama; it moves in one direction only. It is a movement from ignorance to knowledge to union. To this extent the Law of extension and re-absorption⁽¹⁰⁾ is misleading, for the return path is not a retracing of the steps in the precise sense of the word. There is a return to the Pleroma from which all things began, and this is the meaning of extension and re-absorption, but at the same time there has been a movement from ignorance to knowledge. In the end the Aeons know what Only-begotten was prevented by Silence from telling them; through knowledge the Gnostic

9. 'Mit der Gestaltung der Erkenntnis nach aber ist das Ende selbst noch nicht da. Das Endziel für das Göttliche im Menschen ist die "Ruhe im Gamos", mit Herakleon zu reden' (art. cit., NTS 6(1959-60), p. 18). Hence the seventh step of Sagnard's 'mécanisme' should be redefined or perhaps an eighth step added.

10. Sagnard, La gnose val., p. 242.

is re-united with his angelic counterpart, from which he had been separated by ignorance. In the system of Ptolemaeus the movement even includes the idea of education and development. The spiritual seed is emanated small and must grow until it is ready for receiving the perfect Logos. In the Tractatus Tripartitus there is mention of the economy of salvation. A fact that we have just mentioned must be stressed. In spite of the fact that the drama concludes where it began, with the primal Father, the end is not the same as the beginning; even though in the consummation all the spiritual element returns to its place of origin in the Pleroma, there is this difference; that the fundamental cause of the drama, the impossible striving for the unattainable, has been removed.⁽¹¹⁾ There is a well-defined end-goal to the salvation drama in Valentinian Gnosticism.⁽¹²⁾

11. Cf. 'Immer ist es (sc. die Gnosis ihrem Inhalt nach) die Stillung des Verlangens nach dem Urvater, nach dem Schauen seiner unermesslichen Grösse als der Quelle und Wurzel des eigenen Daseins und des Alls d.h. des Pleroma' (Müller, art. cit., p. 225).
12. Peel (art. cit., in NT 12(1970), pp. 155 - 59) lists a number of images relating to the 'Endzeit' in Gnostic literature and concludes: 'The foregoing evidence makes us agree with the stress which Robert Haardt places on the end-goal of the soteriological process in Gnosticism, i.e. the return home of the fallen Light into the Pleroma.' (p. 159). Thus Peel emphatically rejects Zandee's description of the Gnostic conception of the world process as cyclic (*ibid.*, p. 159, n. 1; cf. in addition to the references to articles by Zandee cited by Peel, Zandee, art. cit., in NTT 16(1961/62), p. 367:

It scarcely needs to be stressed that the Valentinian salvation drama is Christocentric. In the world of the

12. (contd.) 'Volgens de cyclische eschatologie van de gnosis'). Peel also rejects the interpretation of the Gnostic conception of eschatological salvation as 'atemporal'; an interpretation that has been virtually traditional in Gnostic studies since Puech's study of the Gnostic conception of time published in 1951 (Eng. trans. H.C. Puech, 'Gnosis and Time', in Man and Time: Papers from the Eranos Yearbooks (New York, 1957; = Bollingen Series XXX/3), pp. 38 - 84) and the interpretation of Gnosticism in terms of Heideggerian existentialism by Jonas and Bultmann. It will be clear from the whole direction of the present study that we share Peel's views of Gnostic eschatology, at least with regard to Valentinian Gnosticism. Whether Gnosticism originally had such a well-defined eschatological goal is not so clear. With regard to the eschatology expressed in Irenaeus, adv. haer. I xxx 14; H. i 240f., Luise Schottroff maintains that 'im Geschehen der Endzeit wiederholt sich mit kosmischen Ausmassen, was jede einzelne Erlösung für den jeweils Erlösten bereits brachte: Die Entmachtung Jaldabaoths' (op. cit., p. 91). In fact, she goes so far as to say that 'die Vorstellung eines Heiles in der Zukunft ist ungnostisch' (ibid., p. 95). In this she agrees with Colpe, who considers that where in Gnosticism redemption is 'set in an eschaton, last judgement etc., one may see the influence of Jewish or Christian eschatology' (TWNT (ET), VIII, p. 414). Schottroff also rejects the idea that in the Ptolemaean system there is an eschatological redemption as distinct from the redemption that occurs on meeting with the Redeemer (op. cit., pp. 93 - 95). Our reading of the evidence adduced above is contrary to this conclusion. Whether developed Valentinian Gnosticism represents a 'christianization' of some form of 'essential Gnosticism'

Pleroma the major participants in the drama are Only-begotten, Logos, Sophia, Limit (in Ptolemaeus), and Christ. Although Only-Begotten, Logos and Christ are distinct emanations in some systems, the distinctions must not be pressed too hard, for the inter-relationships of the Aeons are such that there is unity as well as independence, and there is an essential Christocentricity of the Valentinian thinking that cannot be over-looked. The essential unity of the Aeons is well illustrated by the derivation of the Saviour from all the Aeons.⁽¹³⁾ In addition, in Heracleon and the Tractatus Tripartitus there is far less emphasis on the separate emanations. In the second and third stages of the drama, although in the Ptolemaean system Christ makes a brief appearance to give form to the substance of Achamoth the principal character is the Saviour, who causes Achamoth to beget the spiritual seed and who through Achamoth and the Demiurge created the lower world, to which he also comes in the person of Jesus Christ. The Tractatus Tripartitus is no less Christocentric in this regard, for the redeemed Logos has the most important role in creation.

12. (contd.) cannot be discussed here. From whatever source it originated, and under whatever influences it developed, Valentinian Gnosticism appears to us to have a coherent salvation drama, including a well-defined eschatology.
13. Stead tends to minimize this unity and sees in the division of Christ into so many components an indication that Valentinus 'was unable either to select or combine them. . . . Valentinus' failure was the fruit of theological indecision' (art. cit., pp. 103f.).

It is Christ who brings the knowledge that makes possible the salvation of the pneumatic seed into the Pleroma, the restoration of the essential union between the gnostic and his angel, and the passing of the souls of the righteous (the psychics) into the place of the Midst. In the De Resurrectione the resurrection of Christ provides the basis for the gnostic's hope that he too will rise. Through the sacraments the initiate anticipates his eventual participation in the victory won by Christ; he escapes from the world and enters the Pleroma.

The Christology of the Valentinians is in general totally consistent with these views on redemption. Salvation is a possibility only for the pneumatics and, in a limited sense, for the psychics. Consequently, there is no real incarnation, Christ takes on only those elements that are to be saved. The Christology is both docetic and adoptionist; there is no material element, and the Saviour descends on Jesus at his baptism. The cross is the sign of Limit who separated off the passions of Sophia; it is (in Ptolemaeus) a copy of the instrument on which Christ was extended to form Achamoth according to substance. The cross, then, is the sign of the separating off of the lower nature. It is true that the Christology is not so consistently matched to the idea of redemption in all the Valentinian works studied, but at the same time in none of the works is the Saviour represented as sharing in man's true humanity for the purpose of redeeming man.

So far in this concluding section we have said

nothing about the Gospel of Truth since it raises some special problems of its own. There is no doubt, however, that in the Gospel of Truth we also have a Christocentric salvation drama. The drama itself is a very complex movement. On the one hand it takes place within the Father so that the spiritual beings within the Father, who are ignorant of him and therefore deficient, have their want supplied through the revelation of knowledge, and they then know where they are, that they are in the Father and that they are inscribed in the book of the living. Through the coming of knowledge, the ignorance in them is destroyed. On the other hand, the drama is also presented as an external succession of events, in which ignorance leads to the formation of the world, and the spiritual beings are imprisoned here. These spiritual beings who had their origins in the Father through the Logos have come into this world, and their state is characterized again as deficiency, but this time the deficiency is also an objective reality. Redemption means to escape from this condition and to return to the Father, to re-ascend to the place from which one came. In the internal psychological drama, redemption is simply the bestowal of knowledge, knowledge of the Father and of oneself. In the external mythological drama redemption is tied to the person of the redeemer: that is, to Christ. He alone it is who brings the revelation from the Father that makes it possible to return to the Father. One of the most significant features of this Christocentric salvation drama is that the death of Christ on the cross is the key event in the drama. Since the Gospel of Truth insists that Christ

is the bearer of the divine revelation, it is quite impossible to regard the drama as a purely psychological one. However attenuated the full humanity of Christ becomes, this insistence that the revelation is through Christ necessitates if not a historical revelation, at least the mythological descent of the revelation in the person of Christ. Where Christ is the bearer of the revelation there must be some element of history however small.

While we have accepted so far the general consensus that the Gospel of Truth is Valentinian⁽¹⁴⁾ and have treated it alongside the other Valentinian documents, we must now ask: What is the relationship of this Christocentric salvation drama to the Christocentric salvation drama of the other Valentinian systems? Hans Jonas⁽¹⁵⁾ has argued the Gospel of Truth presupposes the complete Valentinian myth. Jonas's argument may be summarised briefly as follows: The opening lines of the Gospel of Truth indicate that the themes that could be expected in it are 'the content or object of the hope and the ground of the hope' and also the realisation of the hope through the good news.

14. See above, ch. 6, n. 33.

15. 'Evangelium Veritatis and the Valentinian Speculation', in Studia Patristica Vol. VI (Berlin, 1962; = TU 81), pp. 96 - 111. Jonas presents what is in essence the same idea in his review of the editio princeps of the Gospel of Truth in Gnomon 32(1960), pp. 327 - 35, and in The Gnostic Religion, pp. 174ff.

If the work is Valentinian, then we should find 'the speculative reasoning peculiar to Valentinian theory', which is that 'the ground of eschatological hope is in the beginning of all things.' The ground for the eschatological hope lies in establishing 'a convincing nexus between what is proclaimed to be the means and mode of salvation, viz., knowledge, and the events of the beginning that call for this mode as their adequate complement.' In the Gospel of Truth there appear formulae relating to this gospel and its hope: 'Since Oblivion came into existence because they did not know the Father, therefore if they attain to a knowledge of the Father, Oblivion becomes, at that very instant, non-existent.'⁽¹⁶⁾ This however is essentially a tautology, and some key is therefore required to explain its full significance. The formula occurs again in the Gospel of Truth (24.28 - 32) and also in Irenaeus's account of the Gnostics.⁽¹⁷⁾ but there, there is a significant addition: the *συστασις* of Oblivion will vanish with the appearance of knowledge, and that means the whole world structure, the result of the fall of Sophia and the work of the Demiurge. 'In short, the premiss of the formula, presupposed by it and required for the understanding of it, is the complete Valentinian mythos, of which the formula is in fact the epitome.' The reader of Irenaeus knows the myth when he meets the formula, i.e., he has

16. Ev. Ver. 18.7 - 11. Translation as in Jonas, art. cit., TU 81, p. 99.

17. adv. haer. I xxi 4; H. i 186.

the key. The reader of the Gospel of Truth has no key without prior knowledge, and without this key the work is unintelligible. Therefore 'the intended reader of the Evangelium Veritatis must be supposed to have been on familiar ground . . . his familiarity stemming from prior acquaintance with some complete version of the Valentinian myth which enabled him to read the speculative passages of the Evangelium as a mere condensed repetition of well-known doctrine.' As a result of this conclusion, Jonas rejects the contention that the Gospel of Truth is an early work of Valentinus, before the Sophia-myth, Demiurge and specific Aeons became part of Valentinian doctrine. (18)

Up to this point it has been assumed that the 'formula' is in fact Valentinian, but Jonas considers that the fundamental orientation of the 'formula', and therefore of the Gospel of Truth as a whole, is identical with that of the Valentinian school, and indeed could be held only by the Valentinians:

The distinguishing mark of that type of Gnosticism to which the Valentinian School belongs is the bold

18. Helmer Ringgren also admits that at a number of points the Gospel of Truth gives the impression of 'a homiletic use of an already existing system, which is expounded in its basic ideas, but not in its details' (art. cit., in StTheol 18(1964), p. 54), but considers that the system presupposed 'must have been much less complicated than the Valentinian system described by the Christian heresiographers' (ibid.). On the question of whether or not Valentinus himself was the author - a point that is not important here - see above, ch. 6, n. 34.

resolve to place the origin of darkness, and thereby of the dualistic rift of being, within the godhead itself. Hence issue the various attempts to develop the divine tragedy, the necessity of salvation arising from it, and the dynamics of this salvation itself, as wholly a sequence of inner-divine events. Radically understood . . . this principle involves the task of deriving not only such spiritual facts as passion, ignorance, and evil but the very nature of matter in its contrariety to the spirit from the prime spiritual source: its very existence is to be accounted for in terms of the divine history itself.⁽¹⁹⁾

Therefore both knowledge and ignorance are raised to an ontological position of the first order, and this solution to the problem of dualism 'establishes the absolute position of gnosis in the soteriological scheme'. Knowledge by itself, without any external assistance from sacraments, is 'the adequate form of salvation itself'. This idea, which is expressed in the 'formula' twice quoted in the Gospel of Truth, could, according to Jonas, be proclaimed by the Valentinians alone.

This thesis is not without its difficulties. While the argument of Jonas has a certain logic, it presupposes that the Valentinians were just as logical. In fact as we have seen, works such as the De Resurrectione do not follow out the logic of Valentinian Christology to the extent that Ptolemaeus has done; and the Gospel of Philip does not accept the logic that Valentinianism should

19. Jonas, art. cit., TU 81, p. 109.

reject the use of sacraments. The connection, therefore, between the Gospel of Truth, the 'formula', and Valentinianism should not be pressed too hard. K. Rudolph in fact suggests⁽²⁰⁾ that the meaning of the 'formula' is not purely Valentinian, but is 'a characteristic of most of the systems of the second century'. E. Haenchen has also pointed out⁽²¹⁾ that to the fundamental Gnostic question of How did a divine being come to be in this world the 'formula' provides an answer that is different from that of the Ptolemaean system. In the Ptolemaean system the inaccessibility of the Father lays the foundation for the fall of Sophia and the production of the Demiurge and the lower world in which the spiritual being is trapped. In the case of the 'formula', however, there is a real sense in which the drama takes place within the Father. Ignorance is literally a Nothing; concrete existence is really non-existent, and history a mere appearance of reality. It is, so to speak, all a bad dream.

To these differences with regard to the 'formula' and the drama we may add the differences of detail that have

20. art. cit., ThR 34(1969), p. 196.

21. 'Literatur zum Codex Jung', in ThR 30(1964), pp. 39 - 82, esp. pp. 74 - 79. Haenchen goes so far as to say that, for example, with regard to the Sophia-myth, 'die Theologie der "pneumatischen Gleichung" bedarf weder einer Sophia noch eines Demiurgen; ja sie kann diese Grössen nicht einmal unterbringen, ohne sich selbst zu zerstören' (p.78).

been noted elsewhere.⁽²²⁾ Nevertheless, on the other hand, we have seen some very close similarities between some expressions in the Gospel of Truth and the Tractatus Tripartitus, a work that is undeniably Valentinian, and the evidence for a Valentinian provenance put forward by the editors of the editio princeps, by Jonas, Ringgren and others cannot be entirely set aside. There is no room here for dogmatism, but there is at least ample justification for considering the Gospel of Truth under the general heading of Valentinian Gnosticism, even though its doctrines do not lend themselves to ready assimilation to the teachings of our other Valentinian sources. Perhaps we can say, however, that Valentinian Gnosticism is a more varied phenomenon than has sometimes been thought.

Leaving the question of the precise relation of the salvation drama in the Gospel of Truth to the salvation drama in our other Valentinian works, we may observe here that the Gospel of Truth poses the same kind of threat to those who oppose Gnosticism as do the other works: the threat of a coherent, complete drama in which Christ brings salvation to man to enable man to return to his place of origin. The threat emerges most clearly if we compare the Christocentric salvation drama with Christocentric salvation history. The fundamental difference between these is the Gnostic lack of interest in history. This requires closer definition. In a paper

22. See above, ch. 6, n. 33.

delivered to the Messina Colloquium in 1966 H.I. Marrou maintained that to say that the Valentinians had no interest in history was to make too sweeping a generalisation.⁽²³⁾ Ptolemaeus in particular by no means rejected the Old Testament completely, and the Valentinians looked to the historical Jesus as the source of their revelation, a fact that they defended by appeal to their tradition that went back to the apostles. They also awaited the end of time.⁽²⁴⁾ Marrou describes this as 'a veritable theology of history', and goes on to say that the Gnostics were the first theologians not only with regard to trinitarian theology (as Harnack maintained) or with regard to the tradition, but also with regard to the theology of history. This is to overstate the case: 'theology of history' is a misnomer. Ptolemaeus indeed has a favorable attitude to the prophets of the Old Testament, but what the spiritual seed says through them represents an intrusion into this world from the world of the Pleroma. The revelation in the prophets takes place in history and one may even defend its historicity, but it is not part of a divine plan worked out as a process through history, and there is therefore no theology of history as such. If Quispel's résumé of the second part of the Tractatus Tripartitus is correct⁽²⁵⁾ then perhaps we may be closer to a theology of history

23. 'La théologie de l'Histoire dans la gnose valentinienne', in Origini, pp. 215 - 25.

24. *ibid.*, p. 224.

25. See above, pp.322f.

there, but confirmation of that will have to await the publication of the complete work. Just as revelation in history does not necessarily mean a theology of history, so the revelation in the person of Jesus Christ, though it takes place in history, is not fundamentally of history in Valentinianism, in the same way that the Saviour, by virtue of his docetic body, is not of history. With regard to the tradition, a similar distinction must be made. For Irenaeus the tradition is the guarantor of a revelation that is rooted in the historical salvation of the whole man, matter and all, in Christ Jesus, and only in that light can the tradition itself become part of salvation history. For the Gnostics on the other hand, tradition is the guarantor of a revelation that is only superficially related to an historical event, and even in the Gospel of Truth where the historical death of Jesus is stressed, the historical event is not essential to the redemption that is brought. Also, for the Gnostic, the end of history is precisely that: the end of history, not its fulfilment.

Having said that, it still remains true that there is a close relationship between the Gnostic salvation drama on the one hand, and salvation history on the other. Both are dramatic processes in that events are moving towards a designated goal. In salvation history the events are historical events seen as the acts of God in history for the purpose of man's salvation. In the salvation drama the events are stages in the process by which perfection

of the Pleroma is achieved and the Gnostic returns whence he came.

The Gnostic Christocentric salvation drama constitutes a serious problem for the opponents of Gnosticism. The salvation drama presents a coherent and comprehensive scheme in which the central concern is the salvation of man, viewed as the primary point in a movement from ignorance to knowledge, from the primal Father's first self-expression to the accomplishment of the perfection of the spiritual world in the union of the spiritual beings in syzygy. In this movement the central figure is the many-formed Christ. What is demanded of an opponent is that he not only insist on his tradition and attack as many of the individual points of the system as possible, and Irenaeus did both of these things, but that he replace the system with something that is equally consistent, equally coherent, equally Christocentric, and with an equal sense of progression towards a desirable goal. This too, as we shall see in the final section, Irenaeus has done; he has replaced the Christocentric salvation drama with the Christocentric salvation history. In a sense, then, Marrou is correct; Irenaeus did develop his doctrine from the Gnostics, but only in opposition.

PART FOUR

IRENÆUS

CHAPTER NINECHRISTOCENTRIC SALVATION HISTORY

In this final section we come to Irenaeus himself. In the ecclesiastical tradition that lies behind Irenaeus we have seen some of the elements that could be fitted into a scheme of Christocentric salvation history. In Melito of Sardis we have seen a fairly well-developed scheme, and in Justin Martyr all the elements for a complete scheme are present though not resolved into that final synthesis. It is Irenaeus who has carried through the plan in a thorough-going and systematic manner. In Valentinian Gnosticism we have seen another, completely integrated scheme of an entirely different type. In the immediately preceding section we have seen the shape of the Christocentric salvation drama in Valentinian Gnosticism and have expressed the challenge that this offered to 'orthodoxy' as the challenge of a coherent and comprehensive scheme in which the central concern is the salvation of man, viewed as the primary event in a fundamentally Christocentric movement towards a well-defined goal. In this section we shall see that Irenaeus offered a viable alternative to the Gnostic system, viable in the sense that it was in its completeness and comprehensiveness as satisfying as the Gnostic one. What is more, Irenaeus achieved his aim with the materials provided by the ecclesiastical tradition. In the following analysis of the Christocentric salvation history of Irenaeus we shall consider the material under the successive headings: the

Godhead, Creation, Revelation, the Incarnation, Redemption, the Church, and the Consummation.

I THE GODHEAD

In this section we shall be concerned mainly with the relationship of the Son to the Father, but before we say anything about that we must note in a wider context Irenaeus's understanding of God. There is a difficulty in this first section that must be faced immediately. While it is possible to discuss Irenaeus's understanding of the nature of God, this very method involves the danger of failing to do justice to the thought of Irenaeus, for his primary concern - one might almost say exclusive concern - is the activity, not the essence, of God. This point will become even clearer as we proceed.

At the heart of Irenaeus's theology is his belief in the unity of God: 'In this way, then, there is declared one God, the Father, uncreated,⁽¹⁾ invisible, maker of all things, above whom is no other God whatever, and after whom there is no other God.'⁽²⁾ God is one and unique and 'the source of all good things'.⁽³⁾ The oneness of God receives considerably more emphasis in the adversus haereses than it

1. The Armenian text is a translation of ἀγέννητος, but as Froidevaux suggests (op. cit., ad loc.) ἀγέννητος was clearly meant.
2. Dem. 5.
3. adv. haer. IV xi 2; H. i 175; cf. I xii 2; H. i 111; II xiii 3; H. i 282; II xxviii 4; H. i 354.

does in the Demonstratio, but that is only to be expected. One of the principal tenets of the Gnostics was that, although the God of the Old Testament was indeed the creator of this world, he was not the good God that some Christians believed him to be, nor was he the Father of the Lord Jesus Christ, but rather an ignorant demiurge, the product of the tragedy that befell Sophia (in most of the Valentinian systems), out of whose power man could now escape thanks to the knowledge brought to man by Jesus or some other redeemer. Against this or any similar belief⁽⁴⁾ Irenaeus insists vehemently that the God who created and the God who redeems are one and the same. This is emphasised again and again, and especially in Book III of the adversus haereses. One example will suffice: The apostle Matthew knew 'as one and the same (unum et eundem) God, him who had promised to Abraham that he would make his seed as the stars of heaven, and him who through his Son Jesus Christ has called us from the worship of stones to knowledge of himself . . .'⁽⁵⁾ The phrase 'one and the same God' (unus et idem Deus) occurs

4. In his polemical attack Irenaeus does not distinguish between the doctrine of creation held by the Valentinians and that held by Marcion. In Gnostic thought in general, and certainly in Valentinianism as we have seen it above, the Demiurge, fallen and ignorant as he is, is nevertheless derived ultimately from the primal Father. In Marcion there is no such connection, and the Father of Jesus Christ is absolutely alien to the Demiurge and his creation, man.
5. adv. haer. III ix 1; H. ii 30.

over thirty times in the adversus haereses.⁽⁶⁾ In this way, right at the outset we can see that Irenaeus is committed to a system that links the past activity of God with the new activity in Christ.

Not only is God one, he is also absolute, not in the sense of The Absolute, but as the absolute ruler of all that is. Among the principal articles of faith Irenaeus holds 'that the eternal and everlasting One is God,⁽⁷⁾ and is above all creatures, and that all things whatsoever are subject to him; and that what is subject to him was all made by him, so that God is not ruler and Lord of what is another's, but of his own, and all things are God's; that God, therefore, is the Almighty, and all things whatsoever are from God.'⁽⁸⁾ One can detect here the same repudiation of

6. References in B. Reynders, Lexique comparé du texte et des versions latine, arménienne et syriaque de l'Adversus Haereses de saint Irénée (2 vols., Louvain, 1954; = CSCO, Subsidia vols. 5 & 6).

7. The text presents some difficulties. Robinson (op. cit., ad loc.) attaches the initial phrase to what immediately precedes, which concerns man's new status as a son of God. The present phrase, then, refers to man's ultimate status and is translated: '. . . and that what is everlasting and continuing is made God and is over all things that are made . . .' (Wilson in PO, ad loc. is even more explicit). For support Robinson points to adv. haer. IV xxxviii 4ff.; H. ii 297ff. Froidevaux, however, observes that this latter passage offers an explanation of Ps. 81.6f. ('I have said you are gods'), and he explains the passage under discussion as a further article of faith. This certainly gives a

the division between the creator and the redeemer that is characteristic of the Gnostics and Marcion. Irenaeus, in an almost verbal quotation from Hermas, asserts that 'one must believe that there is one God, the Father, who made and fashioned everything, . . . and brought being out of nothing, . . . and, while holding all things, is alone beyond grasp.' (9)

Not only is God absolute ruler of all that exists, but there is an absolute distinction between God and all that God has made: the distinction between creator and creature. Irenaeus emphasises this in particular with respect to man: 'And God differs from man in this, that God indeed makes, man however is made; and in truth he who makes is always the same.' (10) The implication is that God, the creator, is eternal, unchanging, constant; man is temporal, transient, unstable. The transcendence of God, however, does not lead Irenaeus to make God as

7. (contd.) better connection between the opening statement and what follows (Froidevaux, op. cit., ad loc.). Smith (op. cit., ad loc.) makes similar points to those of Froidevaux and suggests that the verb translated as 'is made God' by Robinson is in fact used for the emphasis indicated by the underlining.
8. Dem. 3.
9. Dem. 4. Cf. Pastor 26.1.
10. adv. haer. IV xi 2; H. ii 175.

remote from man as possible. On the contrary, Irenaeus marvels at the condescension of God that he shows compassion and concern for man although he is under no compulsion to do so. 'For, just as God is in need of nothing, so man is in need of communion with God'.⁽¹¹⁾ God, transcendent as he is, can be known by man, but only on the basis of his love;⁽¹²⁾ that is, God is to be known from his activity on man's behalf. It is what God does, not what he is in himself that interests Irenaeus.

It is in this context of the activity of God towards his creation, and especially in the redemption of man, that it becomes possible to see how Irenaeus understands the relationship between the Son and the Father. It is, for Irenaeus, in the activity of God ad extra that the distinctions in the Godhead become apparent: 'And thus God is shown to be one according to the essence of his being and power; but at the same time, as the administrator of the economy of our redemption, he is both Father and Son.'⁽¹³⁾ It is to some extent the very exaltedness

11. adv. haer. IV xiv 1; H. ii 184.

12. adv. haer. IV xx 1; H. ii 212; cf. III xxiv 2; H. ii 132.

13. Dem. 47. On the interpretation of this passage as an example of economic trinitarianism Harnack makes the following judicious comment: 'Nicht nicänisch ist, dass die Differenzierung von Vater und Sohn hier allein aus der Ökonomie der Erlösung begründet wird (eine Art von Modalismus wie in Adv. Haer.). Das ist vornicänisch, vororigenistisch und irenaisch (Harnack, notes ad loc. to the edition of the Demonstratio in TU 31/1).

of God that requires Irenaeus to draw a distinction between the activity of the Father and the Son. The transcendent otherness of the Father was a commonplace of both theology and philosophy at the time. In Gnosticism this transcendence was allied to a radical ontological dualism. For Irenaeus, the transcendence of God does not make him inaccessible to man or mean that man can know nothing about God. Yet here an important point must be noted: man's knowledge of God springs not from speculation about the being of God, but from the contemplation of the activity of God. The initiative for man's knowledge of God lies entirely with God himself: 'Since the Father of all is invisible and inaccessible to creatures, it is through the Son that those who are to approach God must have access to the Father.'⁽¹⁴⁾ The Son, then, is the manifestation of the transcendent Father. Although man can know nothing of God by his own efforts to comprehend God in himself, he can know something on the basis of God's loving activity towards man.⁽¹⁵⁾

Before we go on to say a little more about the distinctions in the Godhead as understood by Irenaeus, it is appropriate at this point to examine more closely the activity of the Word of God in the revelation of the Father. The activity is seen by Irenaeus as the work of the Word in salvation history. The Son was with the

14. Dem. 47.

15. On the Son as the sole revealer of the Father see further L. Escoula, 'Le Verbe Sauveur et illuminateur chez saint Irénée', in NRTh 66(1939), pp. 551 - 61.

Father from the beginning and carried out the work of revelation for man's sake 'in regular order and connection, at the time suitable for the benefit of man. For where there is a regular succession, there is also stability; and where stability, suitability to the time; and where suitability, usefulness. And therefore the Word became the administrator of the Father's grace (dispensator paternae gratiae) for the benefit of men, on whose account he made such great arrangements (tantas dispositiones).'⁽¹⁶⁾

The Son's role as the revealer of the invisible Father is here clearly linked with the ordered succession of events in salvation history, and these events, moreover, are so arranged for the sake of man. The clear link between this and the distinctions in the Godhead emerges in the continuation of the above passage. The Word made such great arrangements for man's sake, 'revealing God indeed to men, but presenting man to God; and, moreover, preserving that of the Father which is invisible, lest man should ever become a despiser of God and so that he might always have something towards which he might make progress; but on the other hand presenting God as visible to men through many arrangements, lest man, being utterly forsaken by God, should by now have ceased to exist.'⁽¹⁷⁾

In this the goal of salvation history appears by implication: the vision of God. So the distinctions in the Godhead are linked not only with the manifestation

16. adv. haer. IV xx 7; H. ii 218f.

17. ibid.

of a transcendent God, but with his gradual revelation in salvation history.

It is the Son who carries out all the activity of God on man's behalf. The salvation history is Christocentric in the sense that the Word is the agent of God in the whole of salvation history: 'For those things which were in like manner spoken of beforehand by the creator through all the prophets, Christ accomplished at the end, carrying out the will of the Father and fulfilling the plan (dispositionem⁽¹⁸⁾) for mankind.'⁽¹⁹⁾ What is more, it is the Word who makes plain to man God's plan for him:

It is plain, that the Father indeed is invisible, of whom the Lord himself said: 'No-one has ever seen God' (Jn 1.18). But his Word, just as he himself (sc. the Father) wished and for the benefit of those who saw, was manifesting the glory of the Father and explaining the arrangements (dispositiones), just as the Lord himself said: 'The only-begotten God (unigenitus Deus), who is in the bosom of the Father, he has declared him' (Jn 1.18).⁽²⁰⁾

This point will receive considerable amplification in the

18. The Armenian reads the singular; the Latin reads the plural: dispositiones. On the justification of the singular see the notes justificatives in the edition in Sources chrétiennes (vol. 152), p. 325.

19. adv. haer. V xxvi 2; H. ii 395f.

20. adv. haer. IV xx 11; H. ii 221. Irenaeus quotes Jn 1.18 three times, and it is preserved in three different readings:

unigenitus filius Dei (III xi 6; H. ii 44).

unigenitus filius (IV xx 6; H. ii 218).

unigenitus Deus (IV xx 11; H. ii 221).

sections that follow. A distinction should be made here between the work of the Word as the agent of God's plan and the work of the Spirit. When Irenaeus has in mind the work of making man understand the activity of God on his behalf he speaks of the Spirit's making the plan intelligible.⁽²¹⁾ We shall have occasion at other points in the study to refer to the role of the Spirit in relation to the role of the Word, but right at the outset it can be stressed that so far as Irenaeus is concerned, in all the activity of God and its explanation it is 'one and same God who, from beginning to end, is present with the human race in the various dispensations.'⁽²²⁾

The salvation historical character of the activity of the Word of God emerges with great clarity from an examination of the divine plan for man which the Word carries out and explains. The plan embraces the whole of man's condition and looks to its ultimate conclusion:

God determining everything beforehand for the perfection of man and the efficacy and manifestation of the arrangements, so that goodness might be revealed and justice perfected and the church conformed to the image of his Son, and that man might at length become mature, through such great things reaching maturity to see and comprehend God.⁽²³⁾

We can see in this the true character of the plan as

21. adv. haer. I x 1; H. i 91; IV xxxiii 1; H. ii 256; IV xxxiii 7; H. ii 262.

22. adv. haer. III xii 13; H. ii 68; cf. IV xxviii 2; H. ii 245.

23. adv. haer. IV xxxvii 7; H. ii 291. On the divine plan in Irenaeus three articles in particular are

salvation history. The *oikonomia*⁽²⁴⁾ is a series of events planned by God and moving towards a predetermined goal.

23. (contd.) worth consulting: A. Verrièle, 'Le plan du salut d'après saint Irénée', in RevSR 14(1934), pp. 493 - 524; K. Prüm, 'Göttliche Planung und menschliche Entwicklung nach Irenäus Adversus haereses', in Scholastik 13(1938), pp. 206 - 24, 342 - 66; W. Hunger, 'Der Gedanke der Weltplaneinheit und Adameinheit in der Theologie des heiligen Irenäus. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis seiner Arbeitsweise', in Scholastik 17(1942), pp. 161 - 77. All three emphasise the unity of the divine plan: that is, that Irenaeus thinks of a single divine plan that is comprehensive and coherent and directed towards a single goal: the salvation of man and his eventually being made in the image and likeness of God. The coherence and comprehensiveness of the divine plan in Irenaeus will emerge clearly from the present study also.
24. The word *oikonomia* raises a number of problems concerning Irenaeus and his work. The word has received some detailed attention from scholars. Loofs (Theophilus von Antiochien, pp. 362 - 64) attempted to show the inconsistencies in the use of the word in the adversus haereses especially in relation to the concept of recapitulation. The word is used by Irenaeus in its singular and plural forms, and Loofs attempted to show that there was a theological difference between the singular and the plural, the singular (Irenaeus's own usage) referring to the salvation of the new man in the Incarnation, the plural (taken over by Irenaeus from his sources) referring to the progressive stages by which God brought man to the definitive revelation. Loofs concluded that Irenaeus had largely confused the issue. This was to misjudge Irenaeus, and it was Martin Widmann (art. cit., ZThK 54(1957), pp. 156 - 73) who

That these events are also the events of man's history, that is, that we are dealing strictly with salvation history is clear from the actual events that are described

24. (contd.) put the matter in its correct perspective by starting with those passages in which the word was indisputably used by Irenaeus himself. With this were compared the remaining passages in the adv. haer., and thus a clear picture began to emerge of Irenaeus's own standpoint and his attitude to his sources. The conclusions of Widmann have been largely substantiated by A. Benoit (op. cit., pp. 219 - 27), which are that the specifically Irenaeian idea of the *οἰκονομία* is of God's universal plan for the world and the redemption of man (see the preceding note); within this over-arching plan there are arrangements (*οἰκονομίαι*) that lead up to and culminate in the Incarnation and passion and outpouring of the Spirit. The understanding of the *οἰκονομία* or *οἰκονομίαι* that emerges from those passages that are probably source material (mainly in Books IV and V) is far less comprehensive than the Irenaeian idea, but nevertheless it does fit in with the Irenaeian concept and was probably used by Irenaeus because of that fact.

It is important to note that even in Irenaeus *οἰκονομία* gains its temporal significance not from the word itself but from the context in which it is used with reference to events that succeed one another and lead up to the major event of the Incarnation. The word in Irenaeus, because of this usage, now closely approximates to salvation history. In this respect Irenaeus marks an advance on the literature that precedes him; it is Irenaeus who gives to the word *οἰκονομία* its temporal scope. See above, pp. 53 - 64 and, in particular, p. 377 n. 71 on the use of the term *οἰκονομία* in Valentinian Gnosticism, where it appears at times to be virtually a technical term for the salvation drama.

as being part of the divine plan. The plan includes, indeed is principally orientated towards, man's salvation and that in itself includes the salvation of the flesh. God's plan for man which the Son puts into effect also involves the Incarnation and the passion. The scope of God's plan embraces the whole work of preparation in the Old Testament, in Adam himself, with Noah, Sarah, Jacob, Lot - in a very unpromising situation - , in the robbing of the Egyptians by the Israelites, and indeed in all the patriarchs and prophets. The preparation extends right up to Mary who co-operated with God's plan. Not only do the figures of the Old Testament help to carry out God's plan, but they know and make known that plan to men. With these events of salvation history

25. adv. haer. III i 1; H. ii 2; III xviii 2; H. ii 95; III xxiv 1; H. ii 131; IV xxvi 1; H. ii 235.
26. adv. haer. IV pf. 4; H. ii 146; V ii 2; H. ii 318; V x 1; H. ii 345; V xiii 2; H. ii 356.
27. adv. haer. III xviii 5; H. ii 98; V xiv 2; H. ii 361; V xvii 4; H. ii 371f.; V xviii 2; H. ii 374; V xx 1; H. ii 378; Dem. 32; 37; 58; 99; 100.
28. See further Houssiau, op. cit., pp. 96 - 104.
29. adv. haer. III xxii 3; H. ii 123 (Adam); I xviii 3; H. i 172 (Noah); I xviii 3; H. i 173 (Sarah); IV xxi 3; H. ii 226 (Jacob); IV xxxi 1; H. ii 252 (Lot); IV xxx 1; H. ii 248 (The despoiling of the Egyptians); IV xxii 2; H. ii 229; IV xxiii 1; H. ii 230 (Patriarchs and Prophets).
30. adv. haer. III xxi 7; H. ii 118.
31. adv. haer. III xvi 3; H. ii 85; IV v 5; H. ii 157; IV xx 10; H. ii 220.

we shall be concerned in more detail in subsequent sections, but it is as well to note here the scope of the plan as a whole, its strict historical character, its undoubted Christocentricity and the fact that this Christocentricity is linked with the distinctions in the Godhead that are visible in the economy of salvation: the activity of God ad extra is the work of the Son.

We return now to the question of the distinctions within the Godhead. The distinctions become clear in the economy of salvation, but they are not just a matter of the divine economy for man; the distinctions are established within the essence of the Godhead.⁽³²⁾ The Son is distinct from the Father and at the same time one with the Father. In his distinction from the Father, the Son carries out the will of the Father always: 'but the Son, administering everything for the Father, works from the beginning to the end, and without him no-one is able to know God.'⁽³³⁾ This distinction is also quite clear within the Godhead; it is not brought about solely on account of the economy. Irenaeus makes it plain that the distinctions are eternal, even if he nowhere seeks to demonstrate that they are essential to the Godhead. As we have already indicated, Irenaeus is not concerned with the nature of the Godhead itself but with God's

32. See above, the comments of Harnack on Dem. 47 (note 13).

33. adv. haer. IV vi 7; H. ii 161; cf. V xxxvi 3;

H. ii 429.

activity, and it is from this that we must draw the implications for his understanding of God in himself. In a number of passages, however, Irenaeus makes clear the eternal distinctions between the Father and the Son. 'Christ, being Son of God before all the world, is with the Father;' (34) 'the Son always co-existing with the Father, from of old and from the beginning always reveals the Father . . . (semper autem co-exsistens filius Patri olim et ab initio semper revelat Patrem);' (35) and even more precisely: 'for not only before Adam, but even before all creation, the Word glorified the Father, remaining in him (sed et ante omnem conditionem glorificabat Verbum Patrem, manens in eo).'(36) It is obvious that Irenaeus clearly distinguishes between the Son who reveals and the Father who is revealed. Nevertheless, the whole act of revelation is the work of one God, since the distinction of revealer and revealed has been there from the very beginning. The two points are complementary; without the distinction the transcendence of God is compromised; yet unless it is one God who is revealed there arises the possibility of the very distinction between creator and redeemer that Irenaeus attacked so strongly in the Gnostics and Marcion. (37)

34. Dem. 52.

35. adv. haer. II xxx 9; H. i 368.

36. adv. haer. IV xiv 1; H. ii 184; cf. III xviii 1; H. ii 95; IV xx 3; H. ii 214; IV xx 7; H. ii 218; Dem. 10; 30; 43; 51; 53.

37. Cf. 'Der Logos ist der sich offenbarende Gott selbst' (Bonwetsch, op. cit., p. 60).

The unity of the Son with the Father is frequently expressed in the context of the revelation of the Father in the person of Jesus Christ. In that context it is said that, whereas the Father is invisible, the Son is visible: 'And through the same Word made visible and palpable the Father is manifested; even if not all alike have believed in him, all have, however, seen the Father in the Son, for that of the Son which is invisible is the Father, but that of the Father which is visible is the Son (*invisibile etenim Filii Pater, visibile autem Patris Filius*).'(38) In this way, the oneness of God in his self-revelation is maintained. Furthermore, this unity is, like the distinctions in the Godhead, seen to exist in the being of God himself and not just in his revelation. Irenaeus several times makes use of the Johannine expressions 'in the Father' and 'in the bosom of the Father' (Jn 1.18).⁽³⁹⁾ Commenting on God's declaration of his name to Moses in Exodus 3.14 and his intention of delivering his people (Ex. 3.8) - both of which declarations Irenaeus attributes to the Son - Irenaeus says: 'Through the Son therefore who is in the Father and has the Father in himself the God who is has been revealed, the Father bearing witness to the Son and the Son proclaiming the Father.'⁽⁴⁰⁾

38. adv. haer. IV vi 6; H. ii 160f. Cf. Ev. Ver. 24.9 - 12; 38.14 - 20.

39. adv. haer. III viii 3; H. ii 29 (in Patre); III xi 5; H. ii 44 (in sinu eius).

40. adv. haer. III vi 2; H. ii 23.

The Son's unity with the Father can also be seen in the discussion of Irenaeus on the use of the name 'God' in the scriptures. Father and Son are called 'God'.⁽⁴¹⁾ The passage that most clearly shows that the unity of the Father and the Son belongs to the being of God and not simply to the divine economy is to be found, however, in the Demonstratio:

Therefore the Father is Lord, and the Son is Lord, and the Father is God and the Son is God; for He who is born of God is God. And thus God is shown to be one according to the essence of His being and power; but at the same time, as the administrator of the economy of our redemption, he is both Father and Son.⁽⁴²⁾

The unity of the Godhead is unmistakable; the distinctions are clearly eternal, and yet Irenaeus works strictly within the framework of salvation history in that it is in the activity of God for man's salvation that the distinctions become apparent.

There are a number of other terms which Irenaeus uses to assert that the revelation given by the Son is the revelation of the one God: He describes the Son as 'the knowledge of the Father',⁽⁴³⁾ as 'the image of the Father',⁽⁴⁴⁾ as 'the hand of the Father',⁽⁴⁵⁾ and as 'the measure of the

41. adv. haer. III vi passim; H. ii 20 - 25.

42. Dem. 47.

43. adv. haer. IV vi 7; H. ii 161f. (agnitio); cf. Dem. 7; IV vi 3; H. ii 159.

44. Dem. 22.

45. adv. haer. IV xx 1; H. ii 213; Dem. 11; etc. The themes of the Son as the image of God and as the hand of God are both considered below. See pp. 580 - 83.

Father'.⁽⁴⁶⁾ In this it is to be observed that there is a clear difference between the Gnostic conception of revelation and Irenaeus's conception of it. The difference does not lie, however, in the nature of the relationship between the revealer and the revealed but in the context in which the revelation takes place. The Valentinian Gnostics and the writers of the ecclesiastical tradition before Irenaeus, notably the Apologists, all attempted to come to terms with the revelation of a transcendent God who is in his essential nature inaccessible to man. In all cases the solution to the problem lies in the fact that the transcendent Father is revealed by one who is both distinct from the Father and at the same time one with him. The details differ of course, but the same essential lines can be seen in the logos-doctrine of Justin Martyr and the name-speculation of the Gospel of Truth and the Father-Son relationship of the Tractatus Tripartitus; the essential lines of diversity in unity.⁽⁴⁷⁾ Irenaeus's teaching does not differ markedly at this point, though again the details are not the same. The difference lies in the fact that Irenaeus attaches this revelation and the work of the Son to history and indeed to salvation history.

A similar point may be noted with regard to the Son's subordination to the Father. Irenaeus does not consider this for its own sake, but at the same time, he makes it

46. adv. haer. IV iv 2; H. ii 153 (mensura).

47. See above, pp. 222 - 33, 358 - 71.

clear that in the carrying out of the economy of salvation the Son is dependent on the Father's will; the ultimate motivation of all things lies with the Father. With regard to the Son as the Father's agent of creation Irenaeus says: 'the Lord who refashioned the eyes, he it is who formed every man, zealously carrying out the Father's will (voluntati Patris deserviens)'.⁽⁴⁸⁾ The Son was 'ministering to his Father's will' when he fulfilled what the prophets had foretold.⁽⁴⁹⁾ The passion came about 'by the will of the Father.'⁽⁵⁰⁾ In these cases the subordination of the Son to the Father's will is related to the economy of salvation. In the light of that, not too much weight should be attached to the following two sentences in which the subordination appears to be related, perhaps, to the Godhead itself:

The Son calls himself the Father's servant, because of his obedience to the Father, every son being a servant of his father among men too.⁽⁵¹⁾

For no-one can know the Father without the Word of God, that is, unless the Son has revealed (him), nor (can anyone know) the Son except by the good pleasure of the Father. But the Son carries out the good pleasure of the Father: for the Father sends, but the Son is sent and comes.⁽⁵²⁾

In neither case is the specific context the work of the Son

48. adv. haer. V xv 3; H. ii 366.

49. adv. haer. V xxvi 2; H. ii 395f.

50. Dem. 69.

51. Dem. 51.

52. adv. haer. IV vi 3; H. ii 159.

in the economy, but that does not mean that these statements can therefore be applied to the inner-trinitarian relationships. The first sentence clearly ends with an aphorism and the second part of the second sentence could also be expressed as a general aphorism: 'But a son carries out the good pleasure of a father: for a father sends, but a son is sent and comes'. Aphorisms cannot provide any solid ground for precise conclusions about inner-trinitarian relationships. Even if the second part of the second sentence is not regarded as an aphorism, the references to 'servant' in the first sentence and to the Son's being sent and coming in the second sentence suggest strongly that the earthly ministry of Christ was in Irenaeus's thoughts rather than the relationships in the Trinity.

From what has been said, a tolerably clear picture has emerged of Irenaeus's understanding of the relationship of the Son to the Godhead. There is one God, but in the working out of the divine economy of salvation a distinction between the revealer and the revealed can be observed. The distinction does not come about simply because of the economy, but is established in the essence of the Godhead. The unity of the Father and the Son and the distinction between them within the divine unity are both eternal, though the Father remains always the ultimate source of the divine will. For our present purpose one factor here deserves special emphasis: the knowledge of God is derived from the observation of God's activity not from speculation about the being of God in himself. That activity is the work of

God for man's salvation, and that work is presented as an unfolding divine plan of salvation history. Thus even the essentially theological questions in Irenaeus cannot be separated from a primary concern for salvation history.

We turn now to a discussion of the generation of the Son and its significance in the scheme of salvation history. The first thing to be noted is that Irenaeus is in no way a speculative theologian. Indeed, as we shall see, Irenaeus resolutely refuses to have anything to do with speculative theology. One point at which this is clear is in Irenaeus's treatment of the names of Christ, which could so easily provide the basis for Christological speculation. In Irenaeus, names such as 'Son', 'Logos', 'Christ', etc. are for the most part simply names and are interchangeable.⁽⁵³⁾ On one occasion when Irenaeus considers the significance of

53. So Beuzart, Bonwetsch, Vernet, and Ziegler in the studies mentioned in part I. Bonwetsch, however, did distinguish between 'Son' (the incarnate Lord as distinct from the Father) and 'Word' (that by which God acted), (op. cit., p. 61). Loofs (Theophilus von Antiochien, pp. 347ff.) disputed this in respect of Irenaeus's own understanding, but distinguished the two in Irenaeus's sources. Houssiau (op. cit., pp. 28ff.) acknowledges Irenaeus's lack of strict distinction among the various titles, but concedes that there may be a certain continuation in the theology of Irenaeus of the different images evoked by the titles 'Son' and 'Logos'.

the name 'Christ' he does so not in relation to the
generation of the Son but in the context of the Incarnation. (54)

On the question of when the Son was generated Irenaeus has nothing to say beyond affirming the Son's pre-existence with the Father. This pre-existence, however, he affirms strongly. He speaks of 'the Son always co-existing with the Father, from of old, indeed, from the beginning;' (55)

'The Word even before all creation was glorifying his Father;' (56) The Lord Jesus Christ is son of David according to the flesh, 'but according to the Spirit, Son of God, pre-existent with the Father, born before all the building of the world.' (57)

The key passage in this connection, however, is chapter 43 of the Demonstratio:

But we must necessarily believe God in all things, for God is in all things truthful. And that there exists a Son of God, and that he is, not only before his appearance in the world, but also before the world was made, Moses, who was the first to prophesy, says in Hebrew: 'BARESITH BARA ELOVIM BASAN BENUAM SAMENTHARES,' of which the translation is: 'A Son (was) in the beginning, then God created heaven and earth.' Witness to this is borne also by Jeremiah the prophet, saying as follows: 'Before the day-star I begot thee, thy name is before the sun,' that is, before the world was made, for at the same time as the world the stars also were made. And again he says: 'Blessed is he who existed before he was made man;' since the Son existed

54. adv. haer. III xviii 3; H. ii 97. See below, p.614.

55. adv. haer. II xxx 9; H. i 368.

56. adv. haer. IV xiv 1; H. ii 184; cf. III xviii 1; H. ii 95.

57. Dem. 30

in the beginning for God before the world was made, but for us, at the time of his appearance, but before that he did not exist for us, in that we knew him not. Therefore also his disciple John, wishing to proclaim to us who is the Son of God who was with the Father before the world came into being, and that everything which came into being came into being through him, speaks thus: 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God; he was in the beginning with God; all things were made by him, and without him nothing came into being,' most plainly declaring that all things were made by the Word who was in the beginning with the Father, and that is his Son. (58)

In this chapter Irenaeus uses four quotations (Gen. 1.1; Ps. 109.3 combined with Ps. 71.17; an unknown quotation

58. In this chapter we have made use of the conclusions of A. Rousseau ('La doctrine de saint Irénée sur la préexistence du Fils de Dieu dans Dém. 43', in Le Muséon 84 (1971), pp. 5 - 42) both for the translation and the interpretation. As Rousseau observes, up until 1952 the whole passage was understood to uphold the pre-existence of the Son, but then, in 1952, J.P. Smith published his translation and commentary on the Demonstratio, and in the notes, and later in a separate article ('Hebrew Christian Midrash in Irenaeus, Epid. 43', in Biblica 38(1957), pp. 24 - 34) argued for a different interpretation, suggesting that Irenaeus held that the Son was begotten by the Father for the purpose of creation, and he even saw traces of the idea of the $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\upsilon\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\theta\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ and $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma \pi\rho\omicron\phi\omicron\rho\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$. This interpretation was adopted by, among others, Froidevaux in his commentary, and Ochagavía (op. cit., pp. 100ff.). Rousseau challenged this interpretation and argued that the Greek verb underlying the Armenian was not $\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ (this was the strongest evidence for Smith's case) but $\epsilon\pi\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\omega$. For this and other reasons the traditional understanding of Irenaeus's theology has been reinstated.

attributed, as with the quotation from the Psalms, to Jeremiah; and Jn 1.1 - 3) in order to assert the eternal existence of the Son over against (a) his coming into existence as man, and (b) the coming into existence of the created world.

So far as the relation of the pre-existence of the Son to the concept of salvation history is concerned one or two important points may be noted. As Houssiau has observed⁽⁵⁹⁾, Irenaeus is not interested in the pre-existence of the Son as such, but in the fact of the activity of the Word prior to the Incarnation, for in that way he can maintain the unicity of God and the continuity between the Old Testament and the New Testament. The problem of the precise moment of the begetting of the Son which was to exercise later theologians does not concern Irenaeus at all. One may go a little further still and say that it is not simply a case of the continuity of the divine action between the Old and New Testaments, but of the eternal quality of the divine action over against the mere temporality of man's existence. From this it is obvious why Irenaeus insists on the existence of the Son eternally in contrast to the coming into existence of the world. There is a difference here between Irenaeus and Justin Martyr. For Justin the generation of the Word is closely bound up with his creative activity; Irenaeus draws a sharper distinction between the

58 (contd.) Full details are in the article by Rousseau.

59. op. cit., pp. 105ff.

Word and the series of events over which he is Lord.

On the related question of how the Son was begotten Irenaeus is as silent as he is about when he was begotten. Irenaeus in fact refuses to discuss how he was begotten, and his refusal takes two forms. In Book II of the adversus haereses, Irenaeus discusses the speculations of the Gnostics in their teaching about the emanations within the Pleroma, particularly with reference to the part played by Mind and Word. He outlines the thought processes in man and concludes as follows: 'But all these, as we have said, Mind (Nus) controls, while it is itself invisible and utters speech (verbum) from itself like rays by means of these processes that have been mentioned, but it is not itself sent forth by some other.'⁽⁶⁰⁾ Irenaeus goes on to suggest that if his opponents had read the scriptures with due attention they would have known that it is not the same with God as it is with man and that his thoughts are not as man's thoughts. By appealing to the fundamental distinction between man and God, and by refusing to turn analogies into identities, Irenaeus refutes his opponents. Irenaeus returns to a similar point in another passage in which he accepts the fact that in man thought follows a sequence of stages; but this, he says, cannot be applied to God, for 'in what will the Word of God be distinct from a word of men, and much more God himself, since the Word is God, if he has the same order and process of generation?'⁽⁶¹⁾ In

60. adv. haer. II xiii 2; H. i 281f.

61. adv. haer. II xiii 8; H. i 285.

another place Irenaeus draws attention to the complex meaning of *λόγος* in Greek, so that one can distinguish between *λόγος* as reason and *λόγος* as spoken word; but with God no such distinction applies, for 'what he thinks, that very thing he speaks, and what he speaks, that very thing he thinks.'⁽⁶²⁾ Irenaeus even goes so far as to discount the worth of any speculation about the generation of the Son, for if the Son admits to being ignorant about the day and the hour of judgement (Mk 13.32), why should we be ashamed of reserving knowledge about the generation of the Son to the Father who begat and the Son who was begotten?⁽⁶³⁾

There can be no doubt that the major reason for Irenaeus's silence about the generation of the Son is the extensive speculations indulged in by the Gnostics.⁽⁶⁴⁾ On the other hand, however, the very nature of his theology would tend to preclude such speculation. Irenaeus's major concern is not with the essence of God, but with his activity, and his emphasis on God's personal concern for

62. adv. haer. II xxviii 4f.; H. i 354. This categorical denial that the distinction between *λόγος ἐνδιάθετος* and *λόγος προφορικός* can be transferred by analogy to God is further evidence against Smith's finding traces of the idea in Dem. 43 (see note 58, above). Houssiau points out that in his argument Irenaeus is making the sole point that if the *λόγος* is *προφορικός* it can no longer be *ἐνδιάθετος*; 'A fortiori, Irénée ne vise en aucune manière la théorie apologétique du double état du Verbe' (op. cit., p. 166).

63. adv. haer. II xxviii 6f.; H. i 355f.

64. See especially Houssiau, op. cit., pp. 164f.

the world of men leaves little room for extensive speculation about the Logos or the generation of the Son.

The silence of Irenaeus about the generation of the Son and his concentration on the activity of God accord well with his concern for salvation history. A similar concern can be seen from Irenaeus's Logos-doctrine. Two quite different ideas can be observed in the work of Irenaeus. On the one hand we can see the use of the Biblical idea of the word of God, that is as a spoken and effective word:

But if anyone holds fast to one God, who made all things by the Word, as Moses himself says: 'And God said, Let there be light, and light was made' (Gen. 1.3), and in the gospel we read: 'All things were made through him, and without him nothing was made' (Jn 1.3) (65)

Here the juxtaposition of John 1.3 and Genesis 1.3 makes plain the link in Irenaeus's mind between the word of God in the Old Testament and the idea of the Logos. The idea of spoken word is even more explicit in the Latin translation at another point: 'and since there is one and the same Father, whose voice is present with his handiwork from the beginning to the end (*cuius vox ab initio usque ad finem adest plasmati suo*) . . . , (66) On the other hand, however, we have the association of the Logos with philosophical concepts in the following:

And God is rational, and therefore produced creatures by his Word. (67)

In the Armenian there is a play on words in the use of the adjective 'rational' and the noun 'Word'. (68) Presumably

65. adv. haer. IV xxxii 1; H. ii 255.

66. adv. haer. V xvi 1; H. ii 367; cf. IV xxviii 2; H. ii 245.

67. Dem. 5.

this is taken over from the Greek in which the play on words would have been between *λόγικος* and *λόγος*. Another passage also bears out the fact that Irenaeus does not completely exclude Greek ideas from his conception of the Logos. He speaks of the Word of God as 'the first-born, the first begotten of the thought of the Father'.⁽⁶⁹⁾

However, in view of Irenaeus's pre-occupation with the activity of God in salvation history, it is not surprising that the commonest idea of the Logos seems to be derived from the Biblical idea of God's word of creation and revelation, and subsequently redemption.

While it is not intended to discuss at length the activity of the Spirit, certain things must be made clear at the outset. At certain points in our consideration of the activity of the Son we shall be obliged to consider the activity of the Spirit as well. At this point it is sufficient to note the relationship of the Spirit to the Son in the Godhead. Like the Son, the Spirit co-exists with the Father and the Son from eternity.⁽⁷⁰⁾ Irenaeus frequently refers to the Son and the Spirit together both in their relationship to the Father and in their activity. Thus he speaks of the Son and the Spirit together glorifying the Father:

This God, then, is glorified by his Word, who is his Son for ever, and by the Holy Spirit, who is the

68. See e.g., the commentaries by Robinson, Froidevaux and Smith, *ad loc.*

69. *Dem.* 39.

70. *adv. haer.* IV xx 1; H. ii 213; IV xx 3; H. ii 214.

Wisdom of the Father of all. And their powers (those of the Word and of Wisdom), which are called Cherubim and Seraphim, with unfailing voice glorify God.⁽⁷¹⁾ In creation too the Spirit shares to a great extent in the activity of the Son,⁽⁷²⁾ indeed, like the Son, the Spirit is present in all the economy of God.⁽⁷³⁾ The distinction

71. Dem. 10. The interpretation of the Cherubim and Seraphim has caused some difficulty. E. Lanne ('Chérubim et Séraphim. Essai d'interprétation du ch. 10 de la Démonstration de S. Irénée', in RSR 43(1955), pp. 524 - 35) concluded that the names Cherubim and Seraphim are attributed to the Son and the Spirit and refer to the creative and kingly power of God. This he maintained on the basis of Philo's description of the two Cherubim as τὰς . . . τοῦ ὄντος δυνάμεις, τὴν τε ποιητικὴν καὶ βασιλικὴν (Vit. Mos. 3.8). Robinson (op. cit., ad loc.) is not as explicit but refers to Origen's identification of the Son and the Spirit with the two Cherubim over the Mercy-seat (Rom. III 8) and with the two Seraphim of Is. 6.3 (de princ. I 3.4; IV 3.26). He refers also to the passage in Philo. Froidevaux (op. cit., ad loc.) objects to this interpretation on three grounds: (1) This identification is made nowhere else by Irenaeus; (2) The text clearly links the Cherubim and Seraphim with the powers and not with the Son and Spirit (cf. also Barthoulot, ad loc.); (3) The direct influence of Philo on Irenaeus is slight, if indeed there is any at all. To this we may add that Philo and Origen are both talking about two Cherubim or two Seraphim, and hence the identification with the two, the Son and the Spirit, is not too difficult, but the text of Irenaeus speaks of the Cherubim and Seraphim, that is, of a minimum of four beings, since both are in the plural. With Froidevaux we may consider that the powers referred to are those elsewhere referred to as

between the Son and Spirit appears most clearly in reference to the Incarnation, in connection with which it is said that 'the Father indeed anointed, but the Son was anointed with the Spirit, which is the unction.'⁽⁷⁴⁾ Furthermore, the Spirit is not only subordinated to the Father, as the Son is, he is bestowed by the Son in accordance with the will of the Father.⁽⁷⁵⁾ A clearer distinction emerges too from the nature of the work of the Spirit in man, convincing man of the saving work of God.⁽⁷⁶⁾ The following passages make this clear:

71. (contd.) being set in order by the Spirit (Dem. 5), and the source of the text as being more likely to be found in the Ascension of Isaiah or the Secrets of Enoch. Smith (op. cit., ad loc.) refers also to Melito of Sardis Frag. 15, where there is a reference to Christ as the charioteer of the Cherubim.
72. See the next sub-section.
73. adv. haer. IV xx 6; H. ii 218; IV xxxiii 1; H. ii 256.
74. adv. haer. III xviii 3; H. ii 97. See below, pp. 614f. on the Incarnation.
75. adv. haer. V xviii 2; H. ii 373; Dem. 7: 'But the Son, according to the Father's good-pleasure, administers the Spirit charismatically as the Father will, to those to whom He will.' Although the Armenian does not make clear whether the final 'He' refers to the Father or the Son, the Father is undoubtedly meant. See Smith, op. cit., ad loc.
76. Despite the fact that Irenaeus identifies the Spirit as the Wisdom of God, there is no real comparison between Irenaeus's doctrine of the Spirit/Wisdom and the Gnostic speculations on Sophia (Wisdom). While it would be fruitful to study and compare the Gnostic doctrine of Wisdom and the 'orthodox' use of the concept,

For one and the same Spirit of God, who indeed proclaimed through the prophets what and of what kind the coming of the Lord should be, interpreted truly through the elders what had been truly prophesied; and he himself through the apostles announced that the fulness of the times of adoption had come and that the kingdom of heaven had drawn near and that he was dwelling in those men who believe in him who was born as Emmanuel of the virgin. (77)

And again:

So the Spirit manifests the Word, and therefore the prophets announced the Son of God; but the Word articulates (78) the Spirit, and therefore it is himself who gives their message to the prophets, and takes up man and brings him to the Father. (79)

And again:

'In us all' is the Spirit, 'who cries: Abba Father,' (Gal. 4.6), and has formed man to the likeness of God. (80)

We may conclude this section with some remarks about Irenaeus's teaching on the Trinity. Although this is a

76. (contd.) that cannot be pursued here. In any case, in Irenaeus the primary concept is not wisdom but the Spirit, co-eternal with the Word, co-operating with the Word in creation and revelation, resting on the Incarnate Word and poured out on the Church. On the Gnostic Sophia cf. above, pp. 335ff., 372ff.

77. adv. haer. III xxi 4; H. ii 115.

78. Smith (op. cit., ad loc.) points out that the Armenian means more than simply 'utters' (so Robinson). The primary meaning of the word, 'to link up', is retained and refers to the Son's work of establishing the Spirit in man.

79. Dem. 5.

80. ibid.

study of the Christology of Irenaeus, it is impossible to begin anywhere other than with Irenaeus's own starting point, the unity of God. God is one, but in the working out of the plan of salvation history certain distinctions in the Godhead become obvious. The distinctions become apparent in the economy, but that does not mean that in Irenaeus we have a form of economic trinitarianism. We would have such a theology if it could be shown that the distinctions in the Godhead existed solely on account of the economy and in that economy; but, as we have seen, Irenaeus lays considerable stress on the fact that the distinctions are eternal. In the economy, one God is at work in a three-fold way. Irenaeus never lets the doctrine of the Trinity become pure dogma. For him the doctrine of the Trinity is about the living God who both has been and is active in his creation, carrying out his plan of salvation history. It is possible that here lies the key reason for his lack of interest in speculation, for speculation involves a measure of objectification, and in the works of Irenaeus God is Subject and not Object: 'And thus one God the Father is manifested, who is over all, and through all, and in us all. For over all is the Father, and he himself is the head of Christ; and through all is the Word, and he himself is the head of the Church; and in us all is the Spirit, and he himself is the living water, which the Lord bestows on those who rightly believe in him, and love him and know that there is one God the Father, who is over all, and through all, and in us all.' (81)

II CREATION

One of the points of Gnostic doctrine that Irenaeus attacked with the utmost vigour was their contention that this world was not the creation of a good God, and above all was not the creation of the God who had brought redemption to man in Jesus Christ. The world according to them, at least as far as Irenaeus understood them, was the product of a deficient Demiurge. Against this position and the somewhat similar ideas of Marcion Irenaeus insists on the identity of the creator and the redeemer. There is and can be only one God; this world is his creation and no-one else's, and he has redeemed this creation through his work in Jesus Christ. In this way there is an inalienable link in Irenaeus's thought between the first creation and redemption. The link goes beyond the idea of creation and creation redeemed, for it is the same Word of God, according to Irenaeus, who is active in both. In short, in Irenaeus's attitude to the creation, we have not a separate section of doctrine, but the first phase of a Christocentric salvation history.

That this world is the work of the one God receives great emphasis from Irenaeus, especially in his adversus haereses. Creation by a Demiurge is ruled out explicitly as is any suggestion that this world was made by angels,⁽¹⁾ for the angels belong to this created order.⁽²⁾ The following is typical of the point made by Irenaeus:

1. adv. haer. IV xx 1; H. ii 213.

2. Dem. 10

Since therefore the entire scriptures, both the prophets and the gospels, can be understood alike by all clearly and without ambiguity even if all do not believe; and since they proclaim that one only God, to the exclusion of any others, made all things by his Word (3)

The belief that this world was the creation of God was the common belief of both Jews and Christians, and it finds expression in the various credal statements of the Church. (4)
There are several of these statements of a credal nature in the work of Irenaeus, and there we can see this common belief stated in a matter of fact way without any polemic, as, for example, in the following:

Therefore, first, one must believe that there is one God, the Father, who made and fashioned everything, and brought being out of nothing, and, while holding all things, is alone beyond grasp. (5)

Despite the matter of fact way in which it is expressed

3. adv. haer. II xxvii 2; H. i 348; cf. II xi 1; H. i 275; II xvi 3; H. i 305f.; II xxx 9; H. i 367f.; III iiii 3; H. ii 11; IV xxxii 1; H. ii 254; Frag. V; H. ii 477f.; Frag. VI; H. ii 478.
4. The appearance in a Creed of statements to the effect that God is the creator of heaven and earth is not necessarily evidence that the Creed was elaborated to refute Marcion. As J.N.D. Kelly observes (Early Christian Creeds, London, 1960, p. 65), 'many of the clauses pointed to as anti-heretical were commonplaces of Christian confessions at a time when the motives alleged were scarcely likely to have been operative.'
5. Dem. 4.

here, this was a point that was fundamental to Irenaeus's attack on the Gnostics, and, as we have indicated above, Irenaeus is not interested in defending the creation of the world by God per se, but as the fundamental presupposition of his doctrine of redemption: that it is his own that God redeems. There is therefore a clear sequence in Irenaeus from creation to redemption. A similar point can be made in respect of the idea of the creatio ex nihilo expressed in the passage above.⁽⁶⁾ God creates out of nothing, therefore God can only save what is his own, for all things are his. Once again the creation is linked with redemption.

Irenaeus's understanding of the role of Christ in creation is established on the conviction of the unity of God. Whatever part is played by the Son or the Word or the Spirit, there is never any question that Irenaeus is thinking of an independent being over against God or alongside God. Nor is the Word ever understood as a divine hypostasis who can be thought of as separate from God in any way. The activity of creation is securely located in the unity of God. This receives expression in several passages where the creative activity is attributed to God without any further qualification. The significance of this last point will become more obvious when, as will be seen, the creative activity is said to take place 'per Verbum' in the majority of cases. One passage in particular shows both the simple ascription of

6. Cf. adv. haer. I xxii 1; H. i 188f.; II x 4; H. i 274; II xxviii 7; H. i 356; Frag. XXXII; H. ii 496f.

creation to God alone, and the location of the activity of the Word and the Spirit in creation within the activity of the one God:

This God . . . who made these things by himself, that is by his Word and his Wisdom (qui fecit ea per semetipsum, hoc est per Verbum et per Sapientiam suam).⁽⁷⁾

Once again, because the creation is God's work, the redemption of that creation can only be by the same God who created it.

We have already pointed out that for Irenaeus the distinctions in the Godhead become visible in the activity of God even though the distinctions are eternal. The most characteristic way for Irenaeus to describe the activity of God in creation is to state that it is 'per Verbum'.⁽⁸⁾ That this in no way detracts from the conviction that the whole Godhead is involved in the act of creation is borne out by an unusual construction that occurs on three occasions, of which the one that offers the clearest example is this:

But if anyone holds fast to one God, who made all things by the Word (Verbo), as Moses himself says: 'And God said, Let there be light, and light was made' (Gen. 1.3). . . .⁽⁹⁾

Here there seems to be little difference between 'Verbo'

7. adv. haer. II xxx 9; H. i 368; cf. II xxviii 1; H. i 349; IV xx 1; H. ii 213f.; IV xxxvi 1; H. ii 277.

8. adv. haer. I xxii 1; H. i 188f.; II ii 5; H. i 256; II xxvii 2; H. i 348; II xxx 9; H. i 368; III viii 3; H. ii 29; etc.

9. adv. haer. IV xxxii 1; H. ii 255; cf. II ii 4; H. i 256; II xi 1; H. i 275.

in the first line and the divine 'fiat' in the second. This does not mean that the Word of God has no other significance than as God's speaking; what it does mean is that the activity of the Word must be seen in its context of the unity of God. The distinctions in the Godhead become much more obvious when, as we shall see, Irenaeus goes on to discuss the work of the Word in redemption; but even there the activity is still that of the one God who by his word made everything that is and who saves it when it had gone astray. Even so, Irenaeus does, on occasion, say that the Word created, without specifying that it is God's Word: 'The Word, who at the beginning established and made them',⁽¹⁰⁾ Furthermore, on several occasions the Word is called 'artifex' and 'fabricator'.⁽¹¹⁾ None of this, however, undermines the unity of the divine action and close link between the creation and its eventual redemption.

Much of what Irenaeus says about the activity of the Word in creation is set in the context of anti-Gnostic polemic. In that setting it is never just the Gnostic

10. adv. haer. IV x 2; H. ii 174.

11. adv. haer. III xi 8; H. ii 47; III xxii 3; H. ii 123; V xv 2; H. ii 365; cf. V xii 6; H. ii 354; V xxiv 4; H. ii 390; Dem. 38. On the basis of the difference between 'the creative Word' and 'God created by his Word' Loofs attempted to deduce a pluralist understanding of the Godhead in Irenaeus (Theophilus von Antiochien, pp. 351ff.), but, as Houssiau observes (op. cit., p. 107), 'la différence . . . est plus littéraire que théologique chez Irénée.'

idea of creation that Irenaeus is attacking, but their whole pattern of creation and salvation. Whereas, for the Gnostic, creation was the work of an ignorant Demiurge and salvation an escape from this predicament, for Irenaeus there is one God who alone creates and saves by his Word. Hence it is in conscious opposition to the Gnostics that Irenaeus developed his Christocentric salvation history, and in that, creation is seen not for its own sake but as the first part of the total plan. This emerges very clearly from Irenaeus's exegesis of the Johannine Prologue. In a long exegesis of John 1.1, 2, 10, 11 and 14, Irenaeus makes the following points:⁽¹²⁾

1. There is one God the Father over all (*unus Deus Pater super omnes*).
2. There is one Word of God through all (*unum Verbum Dei per omnes*),
3. Through whom all things were made . . . by the will of the Father (*per quem omnia facta sunt . . . voluntate Patris*).
4. This is God's world (*hic mundus proprius ipsius*).
5. The Word is our Lord (*hic est Dominus noster*),
6. Who in the last times became man (*qui in novissimis temporibus homo factus est . . .*),
7. Who hung on a tree (*perpendit super lignum*),
8. In order to gather all things to himself (*uti universa in semetipsum recapituletur*).

Here we see with perfect clarity the way in which the creation by the Word and the redemption by the Word are woven together by Irenaeus into the conception of a

12. adv. haer. V xviii 2f.; H. ii 374f.; cf. III xi 1; H. ii 41.

Christocentric salvation history.

The unity of the divine action in creation becomes even more apparent when the role of the Spirit in creation is considered alongside that of the Word. Frequently the two are linked in their creative activity.⁽¹³⁾ To the linking of the Son and the Spirit we shall return in a moment, but the unity of the divine action is emphasised by the exegesis of Genesis 1.26 that understands that it is the Son and the Spirit whom God addressed when he said: 'Let us make . . .'⁽¹⁴⁾ The exegesis clearly states the involvement of the Father, the Son and the Spirit in the work of creation.

The involvement of the Spirit in the creation of the world is supported by the identification of the Spirit as Wisdom, and therefore with the idea of pre-existence and creative function as expressed in Proverbs 8.22ff.; and 3.19f. etc.⁽¹⁵⁾ In one passage Irenaeus does offer some idea of a division of labour in creation between the Son

13. See especially the discussion of the hands of God below (pp. 580ff.).

14. adv. haer. IV pf. 4; H. ii 145; IV xx 1; H. ii 213; V i 3; H. ii 317; cf. V xv 4; H. ii 366 and Dem. 55 where the Son alone is addressed. Cf. also Ep. Barn. 5.5; Theophilus, ad Autol. II 18. The reference to Theophilus in particular raises the question of sources, but the appearance of the construction in the preface to Book IV ensures that from whatever source Irenaeus may have got it, he made the concept his own. See also R. McL. Wilson, art. cit., Studia Patristica I (= TU 63), pp. 420 - 37.

15. adv. haer. IV xx 3; H. ii 214f.; Dem. 5.

and the Spirit:

And God is rational, and therefore produced creatures by his Word, and God is a spirit, and so fashioned everything by his Spirit, as the prophet also says: 'By the word of the Lord the heavens were established, and all the power of them by his Spirit' (Ps. 33.6). Hence, since the Word 'establishes', that is, works bodily and consolidates being, while the Spirit disposes and shapes the various 'powers', so the Word is fitly and properly called the Son, but the Spirit the Wisdom of God.⁽¹⁶⁾

Nevertheless, this must be seen in the context of the creative work of the one God.

The unity of the divine act and the linking of the Son and the Spirit in the creation receive an unusual emphasis in the description of the Son and the Spirit as the hands of God.⁽¹⁷⁾ The idea occurs only once in the Demonstratio,⁽¹⁸⁾

16. Dem. 5; cf. adv. haer. II xxii 1; H. i 326f. 'And by his spirit all their power': as the various commentators point out the LXX reads: 'by the breath of his mouth'. With regard to the concluding sentence Froidevaux (op. cit., ad loc.) refers the first part of the sentence to the creation of the flesh and distinguishes the Word's creation of the flesh from the Spirit's ordering of the heavenly powers. To restrict the first part to the creation of the flesh seems too narrow in the present context. As Smith observes 'the Son's work is all-pervading' (op. cit., pp. 139f.). However, Smith does agree that the text is a little ambiguous and concedes that the reference may be either to the Word's creative role, or to the fact that the Son is, so to speak, the 'embodiment' of the invisible Father.

17. Cf. Theophilus, ad Autol. II 18, and see above the remarks about sources in note 14.

18. Dem. 11.

but is fully worked out in the adversus haereses. The clearest presentation of it is in the following passage:

For God had no need of these (beings) for making those things which he had decided beforehand should be made, as if he himself did not have his own hands. For with him are always the Word and the Wisdom, the Son and the Spirit, through whom and in whom he freely and of his own will made everything, to whom also he speaks, saying: 'Let us make man after our image and after our likeness' (Gen. 1.26).⁽¹⁹⁾

The use of this concept is not restricted to the work of creation in the beginning, and on several occasions is used by Irenaeus to emphasise that the creative work of God, far from being a single act initially, is a continuing activity directed to one primary end: the fashioning of man after the image and likeness of God:

For never at any time has Adam escaped the hands of God, whom the Father addressed, saying: 'Let us make man after our image and likeness' (Gen. 1.26). And therefore, at the end (in fine) 'not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of a man, but by the good pleasure of the Father' (Jn 1.13) his hands perfected the living man (*manus eius vivum perfecerunt hominem*), that Adam might be made after the image and likeness of God.⁽²⁰⁾

In this passage a direct line is drawn between the original

19. adv. haer. IV xx 1; H. ii 213; other references to the initial creative work of the hands of God are: IV pf. 4; H. ii 145 and Dem. 11. In two other places there are references to creation by the hand of God, identified as the Word: III xxi 10; H. ii 120; III xxii 1; H. ii 121.
20. adv. haer. V i 3; H. ii 317; cf. IV xxxix 2; H. ii 299; Vvi 1; H. ii 333; V xxviii 3; H. ii 403.

creative work and the continuing work, leading to its ultimate end. The references to 'in fine' and John 1.13 indicate that the line passes through the Incarnation. To the Incarnation we shall return, but once again we may note here that the creation itself is set in the context of salvation history.

The idea of the continuing creative work of the Word provides Irenaeus with yet another weapon against the Gnostics. The major concern of Irenaeus here, of course, is the identity of the creating and redeeming Word of God. In his exegesis of John 9, Irenaeus emphasises that it is the same Word who once created and who created us in the womb who now creates out of dust an eye for the man who had been born blind.⁽²¹⁾ A similar idea is expressed elsewhere by the thought that the hand of God permeates the whole universe and nourishes and preserves us.⁽²²⁾

One further aspect of Christ's role in creation remains to be mentioned here: that he is the image after which man is made. We shall not outline Irenaeus's anthropology at this point since the whole matter will be treated in some detail in the section dealing with redemption. Here it is

21. adv. haer. V xv 2 - xvi 1; H. ii 365 - 68; the same point emerges from Irenaeus's attack on the Gnostic exegesis of Mt. 11.27: the Word did not begin to reveal the Father from the time of the Incarnation, but always administers everything for the Father from beginning to end. (adv. haer. IV vi 7; H. ii 161f.). Cf. V v 1; H. ii 330.

22. adv. haer. IV xix 2; H. ii 211.

sufficient to note that for Irenaeus the image of God is the Son, and man is made after the image; that is, man is patterned on Christ, the Son of God.⁽²³⁾ This will be of great significance in linking the Incarnation to the creation as the climax of a whole process of development.

From this brief analysis it becomes clear that the role of the Word in creation is firmly located in God's total creative activity, and is paralleled by the work of the Spirit. Creation itself is also located in the whole context of the divine plan as its beginning. In a real sense Irenaeus works back from redemption to creation. Together, the Word and the Spirit are described as the hands of God, and in this way in particular, but also throughout the whole activity of God, the distinctions and the unity of the Godhead are maintained; the Word is neither independent of God in any way nor simply another name for God. The Word, from the point of view of man's understanding, is seen in the activity of God ad extra, and here especially in the creative activity of God; but the distinction and the unity are eternal.

III REVELATION

We have already seen in the discussion of the relationship of Christ to the Godhead, that the activity of God ad extra is carried out by the Son; the Father is revealed by the Son; the creation is performed per Verbum.

23. Dem. 22; cf. adv. haer. V xvi 2; H. ii 368.

As with the creation, so also with the activity of revelation in the Old Testament, the work is to be understood first and foremost as God's work. However the revelation is mediated, the ultimate authority and purpose lie with God. Much of what Irenaeus says about the revelation of God in the Old Testament is set in the context of his polemic against the Gnostic division between the Old Testament revelation and the revelation in Christ.⁽¹⁾ For Irenaeus, all things begin and end with God, and that includes the revelation in the Old Testament. It is the one God who spoke to the fathers and gave the Law through Moses.⁽²⁾ It is the same Word of God who spoke to Moses and proved the Sadducees wrong.⁽³⁾

The self-revelation of God to man, however, is not something that can be done all at once. The whole plan of God for man is that he should eventually see God face to face. The process by which man slowly becomes prepared for that vision embraces the whole of history; it leads through the Old Testament to the Incarnation and on to the final consummation. The self-disclosure of God is part and parcel

1. In his attack on the Gnostics and Marcion Irenaeus renders the Gnostic position as a fairly simple one of rejecting the Old Testament as the work of the Demiurge. This is not strictly fair to the Gnostics, particularly to the Valentinians as they appear in the work of Ptolemaeus. See above, pp. 428 - 33.
2. adv. haer. III x 2; H. ii 35.
3. adv. haer. IV v 2; H. ii 155f.; cf. III xv 3; H. ii 81; IV vii 4; H. ii 164.

of salvation history. In regard to the Old Testament, Irenaeus emphasises that Moses did not see God face to face (Ex. 33. 20 - 22): 'therefore the prophets did not see God's very face directly (manifeste), but the arrangements and mysteries by which man would begin to see God (sed dispositiones et mysteria, per quae inciperet homo videre Deum).'⁽⁴⁾ The understanding of the Old Testament as a preparation for the New Testament will become even more obvious as we proceed.

When we consider the role of Christ in the Old Testament revelation, we can make a distinction between the role played by Christ in the revelation itself and the content of the revelation. Essentially the distinction is that the Word spoke to man through the Law and the prophets, and the Law and the prophets foretold the coming of Christ. Both these aspects, however, find their appropriate place in the whole plan of God, for through the Law and the prophets Christ was himself preparing men for his own coming in the Incarnation to save them:

4. adv. haer. IV xx 10; H. ii 220. Despite the fact that this and a number of other passages cited with reference to prophecy may well come from one of Irenaeus's sources (identified by Loofs as IQT at this point), we shall continue to use the evidence as valid for Irenaeus himself, since (a) he is finally responsible for what he has written or quoted; and (b) he clearly regards this as fundamentally his own view on the subject of prophecy.

Therefore the prophets, receiving grace for prophecy from the same Word, proclaimed beforehand his coming in flesh (αὐτοῦ τὴν ἑνσαρκον παρουσίαν).⁽⁵⁾

The major concern of Irenaeus here is still the continuity of the divine action between the Old Testament and the New, but his language often implies a period of growth from the Old Testament to the New. The metaphor of seed and harvest is in fact used:

For the patriarchs and prophets sowed the word about Christ as a seed (disseminaverunt enim sermonem de Christo patriarchae et prophetae); but the Church reaped, that is, received the fruit (demessa est autem ecclesia, hoc est fructum percepti).⁽⁶⁾

The metaphor clearly conveys the suggestion not just of continuity, but of development.⁽⁷⁾

We have already seen that the self-revelation of God is effected through the Son, and this is true of the Old Testament as well as elsewhere. As in Justin Martyr⁽⁸⁾ the

5. adv. haer. IV xx 4; H. ii 215; Greek text preserved in the Florilegium Achridense and edited by M. Richard and B. Hemmerdinger in ZNTW 53(1962), p. 254.

6. adv. haer. IV xxv 3; H. ii 234.

7. Houssiau, commenting on Irenaeus's use of Jn 4.36 - 38 (adv. haer. IV xxiii 1; H. ii 230), says: 'En s'appuyant sur cette parole du Seigneur, Irénée démontre que la prédication prophétique et la prédication apostolique proviennent du seul et même Dieu; l'une prépare à l'autre, comme l'ensemencement prépare la moisson: Dieu donne à l'un la semence, à l'autre le pain! (op. cit., p. 85).

8. See above, pp. 222ff.

theophanies of the Old Testament are manifestations of the Word. Accordingly, Irenaeus maintains that the Jews have cut themselves off from God because they think they can know the Father himself without the Word or Son, 'being ignorant of him who spoke to Abraham in human form (in figura humana), and again, said to Moses: "I have indeed seen the affliction of my people in Egypt, and have come down to free them" (Ex. 3.7f.).' (9)

More important than the simple appearance of the Son in the theophanies is the fact that in them the Word indicates part of the scope of the divine plan. The Word frequented paradise, (10) which was 'so fair and goodly' that 'the Word of God was constantly walking in it; He would walk round and talk with the man, prefiguring what was to come to pass in the future; that is, that he would dwell with him and talk with him, and be with men, teaching them righteousness.' (11) So, from Eden itself the plan of God looks forward to the Incarnation. It was the Word who

9. adv. haer. IV vii 4; H. ii 164; cf. III vi 1f.; H. ii 21 - 23; IV vii 1; H. ii 162; IV ix 1; H. ii 169; IV xx 9; H. ii 220; Dem. 2; 24; 46.

10. As with Melito of Sardis (see above, pp. 282f.

Paradise is not on earth, but in a region beyond the world, from where man, when he disobeyed God was cast down to this world, and to where Enoch and Elijah were translated and also Paul in his ecstasy (II Cor. 12.4), and there the just await the consummation (adv. haer. V v 1; H. ii 331).

11. Dem. 12.

chose the patriarchs;⁽¹²⁾ it was the Word whom Abraham followed in order to dwell with him.⁽¹³⁾ It was the Word who delivered the Law to Moses,⁽¹⁴⁾ and the writings of Moses are the very words of Christ.⁽¹⁵⁾ If, as Paul says, Christ is the end of the Law (Rom. 10.3f.), then, argues Irenaeus, he must also have been the beginning of the Law.⁽¹⁶⁾ The Law, therefore, has a beginning and an end, and is a temporary expedient until the coming of Christ. Irenaeus even sets the Law more firmly in the total divine plan when he says that he whose mind is free from error will acknowledge that 'the Law according to Moses and the grace of the New Testament, both appropriate to the times (*utraque apta temporibus*), were bestowed by one and the same God for the benefit of the human race (*ad utilitatem humani generis*).'⁽¹⁷⁾ So too the covenant of circumcision was given 'at the appropriate time' (*apto tempore*).⁽¹⁸⁾ Even David, after being accused by Nathan, is to pass sentence on himself 'that he may obtain mercy and forgiveness from Christ'.⁽¹⁹⁾ The whole Old Testament strains towards its

12. adv. haer. IV xxxvi 8; H. ii 285.

13. adv. haer. IV v 3; H. ii 156; cf. Dem. 44.

14. adv. haer. V xxii 1; H. ii 385; cf. Dem. 26

15. adv. haer. IV ii 3; H. ii 148.

16. adv. haer. IV xii 4; H. ii 179.

17. adv. haer. III xii 11; H. ii 66.

18. *ibid.*

19. adv. haer. IV xxvii 1; H. ii 239.

fulfilment in Christ, and the movement towards the Incarnation receives its impetus from Christ himself. Enoch and Elijah were translated by the same hands that made them, 'for in Adam the hands of God became accustomed (εἰθισμέναι ἦσαν) to control and rule and bear what they had fashioned (ῥυθμίσειν καὶ κρατεῖν καὶ βαστάζειν τὸ ἴδιον πλάσμα), and to carry and place it wherever they wished.' (20) For Irenaeus the Old Testament is undoubtedly Christocentric salvation history, in the sense that Christ himself is, through the revelation of the Old Testament, bringing the purposes of God nearer to fruition in history. (21)

Christ is not only the one who reveals, he is also the essential content of the revelation: Christ reveals himself. Once again we shall see that this revelation is part of the plan of God gradually worked out in history. It would be tedious in the extreme to list here all the texts used by

20. adv. haer. V v 1; H. ii 330; Greek preserved by John of Damascus, Sacra parallela and (fragmentarily) the Jena papyrus. Cf. also V v 2; H. ii 332.

21. Cf. 'All these texts point to the fact that typological actions, according to the thought of Irenaeus, were something more than a rapid and preliminary sketch of the future drama: a sketch draws the general line of action of the drama and gives the main traits of the members of the cast, but the real actors are not there. For Irenaeus, on the contrary, the actors of the drama of our salvation - the Word, the Spirit of God, and even Jesus Christ, that is to say, the Word made flesh - were present and active in the typological actions' (Ochagavía, *op. cit.*, p. 56).

Irenaeus and his exegesis of them to illustrate that the content of the revelation delivered by the Word through the prophets is in fact the Word himself, but we can indicate that the content refers to every aspect of the work of the incarnate Word from the circumstances of his birth to his final return in glory at the end of time. It is all there: the birth, ministry, passion, death and resurrection; the growth of the Church as a result of the promised outpouring of the Spirit; the final summing-up of all things in Christ. This is in fact the theme of the second part of the Demonstratio:⁽²²⁾ a demonstration that what God through the prophets had said he would do, had in fact been accomplished in the work of the incarnate Word. In this we see once again that the Old Testament is but a preparation for the New. We fully expect to find this theme in Irenaeus's major attack on the Gnostics, for it offers him a weapon to demonstrate the oneness of the activity of the one God, but the appearance of the theme in over half of his smaller work indicates something of its significance for him quite apart from polemical considerations.

Some special features of the prophecies about Christ require closer examination, especially those related to the tension that exists between the genuine validity of the old and its supersession by the new. In the first place, Irenaeus regards the prophecies about Christ in the Old Testament as akin to the treasure hidden in a

field:

For all prophecy, before it takes effect, is full of riddles and ambiguities. But when the time has come (ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ὁ καιρός), and what was prophesied has happened, then the prophecies have a clear and certain meaning. . . . (Scripture) when it is read by Christians is a treasure hidden in a field, but disclosed by the cross of Christ (23)

The Old Testament did not, therefore, proclaim Christ explicitly and openly, at least, not without the key to the Scriptures: the cross of Christ. Once that key was found, however, the whole purpose of God became crystal clear, and Irenaeus can say without any contradiction of what we have just quoted above: 'But through the Law and the prophets alike the Word proclaimed beforehand both himself and the Father; and indeed all peoples alike have heard, but not all alike have believed.' (24) The Old Testament can be understood only in the light of its fulfilment - it looks forward to the New Testament.

Quite apart from the fact that prophecies can be understood only in the light of their fulfilment, Irenaeus also insists that the prophets did not see the whole Christ. Irenaeus uses the analogy of the body as an illustration of the way in which each prophet, like a member of a body, saw and prophesied a particular aspect of Christ, but again like members of a body, it is only when all are considered

23. adv. haer. IV xxvi 1; H. ii 234f. Greek preserved in Catena in Matthaeum; cf. Dem. 25.

24. adv. haer. IV vi 6; H. ii 160.

together that the full picture emerges clearly. (25)

Irenaeus then gives a detailed list of references to Christ's life and works as prefigured by the prophets. (26) Some prophets therefore see the birth of Christ, others his suffering. This same point occurs elsewhere associated again with the idea of the appropriateness of the time at which the various stages of God's plan are carried out. Some of the prophets, then, saw 'the Father's glories, (27) adapted to the times (*glorias paternas temporibus aptas*)'. The prophets too are members of Christ. (28) Not only does this ensure the continuity of the Old and New Testaments, but it indicates that the prophetic enterprise, important as it is in preparing the ground, is never more than preparation and looks to its fulfilment in Christ.

Emphasising as he does the continuity between the Old and New Testaments and the fact that both are the work of one and the same God, (29) Irenaeus is at the same time acutely aware that this very emphasis could lead some people to ask: What, then, is the point of the new, if it is all there, foretold beforehand, in the old? We have already seen that Irenaeus's answer to that lies in terms of preparation and

25. adv. haer. IV xxxiii 10; H. ii 264f.; cf. IV xx 5; H. ii 216.

26. adv. haer. IV xxxiii 10 - xxxiv 1; H. ii 264 - 69.

27. adv. haer. IV xx 6; H. ii 218.

28. adv. haer. IV xxxiii 10; H. ii 264.

29. adv. haer. IV ix 1; H. ii 169. Houssiau (op. cit., pp. 79 - 86) discusses in detail the close link between this theme and the unity of God in Irenaeus's polemic.

fulfilment, but he himself employs another metaphor: the difference between the Old and the New is the same as the difference between the proclamation of the king's coming and his actual arrival.⁽³⁰⁾ The difference between this conception of the relationship between the Old Testament and the New and the conception found in, e.g., Melito of Sardis, where the Old Testament is likened to a scale planning model that can be discarded once the reality has come,⁽³¹⁾ is that Irenaeus sets his conception in the context of a salvation history that includes man's development in it. The Old Testament revelation was appropriate to man's level of development at the time, and through it God was preparing man for the coming Incarnation. God was indeed 'in numerous ways fitting the human race for agreement with salvation (*multis modis componens humanum genus ad consonantiam salutis*)'.⁽³²⁾

The advantages which Irenaeus discovers in his approach to the Old Testament are that he can preserve the transcendence and invisibility of God in every way prior to the Incarnation, and yet affirm the continuity and unity of the divine action in both the Old and New Testaments. What is more, the salvation history that is in many ways inherent

30. adv. haer. IV xxxiv 1; H. ii 269; cf. IV xi 3; H. ii 175. Cf also, 'La nouveauté se marque dès lors non par l'intervention d'un nouveau dispensateur, mais par la supériorité accordée maintenant par le même Verbe' (Houssiau, op. cit., p. 113).

31. See above, pp. 286ff.

32. adv. haer. IV xiv 2; H. ii 185.

in this understanding, itself advances on two levels: first in the fact that the prophets all look to the fulfilment of their hopes in Christ - hopes which they had only seen 'prophetic'; and second, and perhaps more important from the point of view of salvation history, the old revelation is given a permanent value in that it was appropriate to the stage of man's development at the time.

IV THE INCARNATION

In accordance, therefore, with the statements of the prophets that the Son of God should become incarnate, Christ was born. So far we have been considering the activity of the Word of God from the moment of creation till the Incarnation, but at this point we must discuss some of the strictly Christological problems associated with the Incarnation. As we pointed out at the beginning, Irenaeus's prime concern is with the activity of God and not his essence, but, just as we had to clarify his understanding of the relationship of Christ to the Godhead, so we must make clear Irenaeus's understanding of the relationship of the divine to the human in Christ, for on this depends a great deal of the strength of his conception of salvation history, by which the man made by God is saved by him and fitted for communion with him.

The insistence that we have noted on the uniqueness of God is carried on into the insistence that it is one and the same God who is made manifest in Jesus Christ. Where the Gnostics distinguish between the creator and

the redeemer, Irenaeus emphasises the unity of the divine action. At the heart of all creative and redemptive activity or history there is and can be only one God.⁽¹⁾ Not only is this so, but the Word of God who became incarnate is the one and the same Word who was active beforehand in creation and revelation and who was pre-existent in the beginning with the Father and the Spirit:

Every contradiction of those who say that if he was born then, therefore before that he was not Christ is ruled out by the clear demonstration that the Word, who existed in the beginning with God, through whom all things were made, who also was always present with the human race, was in the last times (in novissimis temporibus), in accordance with the time fixed by the Father (secundum praefinitum tempus a Patre), united with his own workmanship (unitum suo plasmati), having become a man liable to suffering (passibilem hominem factum).⁽²⁾

Much of what Irenaeus has to say about the Incarnation is set in the context of polemic against the Gnostic understanding of it. As represented by Irenaeus in his attack on them⁽³⁾ the Gnostics not only distinguished

1. e.g. adv. haer. III ix 2; H. ii 32.

2. adv. haer. III xviii 1; H. ii 95.

3. We are not concerned here with the accuracy of Irenaeus's picture of the Gnostics. From the evidence of his own work it is clear that he has on occasion reduced the argument of the Gnostics to its simplest terms in order to attack it better, and he classifies Marcion in the same grouping as the Valentinians. In his attack on the Valentinians Irenaeus often ignores some of the finer distinctions, but, within the bounds of the material he discusses, Irenaeus is reasonably fair and accurate. What Irenaeus cannot be held responsible for is that the

between the creator and the redeemer, they also distinguish-
 ed between Jesus and Christ. The latter distinction is the
 corollary of the former: if the creation is not the work of
 the supreme God but of a lesser Demiurge and is in fact a
 product of ignorance, then the work of salvation becomes in
 effect an act of escape from the clutches of the Demiurge
 and his creation. Christ as the redeemer can have nothing
 to offer to the work of the Demiurge as such, only to the
 real man within. Since Jesus manifestly belongs to the
 order of created things he plays no essential role in the
 work of salvation, but is simply a vehicle for the heavenly
 Christ.⁽⁴⁾ Against this position Irenaeus argues with his
 utmost vigour and insists on two important things with
 regard to the Incarnation: first, that it is the Word of
 God, the same Word who has already been the mediator of the
 divine activity ad extra, who becomes incarnate; and second,
 that he does indeed become incarnate, and not descend on
 Jesus at some point in the latter's life.

That it is the same Word who becomes incarnate

3. (contd.) phenomenon of Valentinian Gnosticism is much
 more diverse in both its ideas and their expression than
 he imagined. For a discussion of the Valentinian views
 of the descent of the Saviour see above, pp. 434 - 57.
 On Irenaeus's reduction of the Gnostic theories to the
 fact that they had divided Jesus and Christ and denied
 the real Incarnation see adv. haer. III xvi 1; H. ii 82;
 III xvi 8; H. ii 89; III xi 3; H. ii 42f., and Houssiau,
 op. cit., pp. 158 - 62.
4. This is essentially correct, except that, at least for
 the Valentinians such as Ptolemaeus, Jesus himself is
 not of the material world, but is psychic. See above,
 pp. 434 - 57.

Irenaeus never tires of saying. We have seen one example above and the following is similar: The Gnostics are ignorant 'that his (sc. the Father's) only-begotten Word, who is always present with the human race, united to and mingled with his handiwork (suo plasmati) in accordance with the Father's pleasure and become flesh, is himself Jesus Christ our Lord, who . . .'(5) It is also the same Word who will return in judgement as the passage goes on to say.(6) It is one and the same Word throughout. Just as the oneness of God in his self-revelation is maintained by calling the Father the invisible of the Son and the Son the visible of the Father,(7) so the Word is the one invisible, incomprehensible, impassible Word who has become visible, comprehensible and passible in his Incarnation.(8)

That the same Word of God really becomes incarnate Irenaeus demonstrates at length.(9) His proof consists of a collection of texts, all adduced to show the same point:

clearly showing both that the promise made to the fathers had been fulfilled, namely, that the Son of

5. adv. haer. III xvi 6; H. ii 87.

6. Cf. also adv. haer. IV iv 3; H. ii 153.

7. adv. haer. IV vi 6; H. ii 160f., see above, pp. 546ff.

8. See Houssiau, op. cit., pp. 224 - 30; cf. '(Irénee) n'a voulu admettre que deux états du même Verbe: invisible et impassible dans sa condition éternelle, le Verbe est devenu visible et passible dans sa vie mortelle' (ibid., p. 230).

9. adv. haer. III xvi 2ff.; H. ii 82ff.

God was born of a virgin, and that this same was Christ the Saviour, whom the prophets had foretold: Not, as these (i.e. the Gnostics) assert, that Jesus was he who was born of Mary, and Christ was he who descended from above.⁽¹⁰⁾

The texts, taken from Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Romans, Galatians and I John, are used to deny any possibility of an adoptionist Christology. From the very moment of his birth he is Christ, before his birth in fact, for all this was simply taking place by the will of the Father as the prophets, prompted by the same Word who was now incarnate, had said. It is the same Word of God who descends invisibly from heaven and becomes incarnate,⁽¹¹⁾ it is

10. adv. haer. III xvi 2; H. ii 83; cf. III xvii 4; H. ii 94.

11. Dem. 84; cf. adv. haer. IV xxxiii 13; H. ii 267f. Irenaeus's cosmology presents some interesting parallels. According to Irenaeus the world is encompassed by seven heavens in which dwell the powers, angels and archangels (Dem. 9). The seven heavens figure prominently in Gnostic speculations of course, but they are also found in the Ascension of Isaiah, and it is more probable that both Irenaeus and the Gnostics share a common background in apocalyptic Jewish literature at this point than that Irenaeus is dependent on Gnostic speculations. With the Ascension of Isaiah Irenaeus also shares the idea of Christ's invisible descent contrasted with his visible ascent (Dem. 84; cf. also Ev. Ph., para. 26). See Daniélou 'Judéo-Christianisme et Gnose', in Aspects du Judéo-Christianisme, pp. 139 - 64, especially pp. 148 - 52, and the literature cited there.

the same Son of God who was born of Mary, ⁽¹²⁾ it is the Christ whom Simeon holds in his arms and the shepherds see, ⁽¹³⁾ 'for Christ did not then descend on Jesus (sc. at the Baptism); nor indeed is Christ one and Jesus another, but the Word of God, who is the Saviour of all and the ruler of heaven and earth, who is Jesus, as I have already shown, who both took flesh and was anointed by the Father with the Spirit, became Jesus Christ.' ⁽¹⁴⁾

When we come to consider the person of Jesus himself, we find the same refusal to indulge in speculation which characterised Irenaeus's understanding of the relationship of Christ to the Godhead. How it is possible for Jesus Christ to be God and Man and one person Irenaeus does not attempt to answer; the paradox at the heart of Christology is left as a paradox, and each of the points of the paradox is equally insisted on. His insistence on the unity of the person arises in part from the distinction made by the Gnostics. Although that may explain the emphasis the point receives, the point itself is fundamental to Irenaeus's Christology. Against the Gnostic idea Irenaeus makes use of numerous quotations from the New Testament, and his position is well summed up in his discussion of St. Paul:

12. adv. haer. III xvi 2; H. ii 83.

13. adv. haer. III xvi 4; H. ii 85.

14. adv. haer. III ix 3; H. ii 32.

Therefore he knew nothing of that Christ who flew off from Jesus; nor did he know of that Saviour who is above, who they say is impassible. For if then one suffered but the other remained impassible, and one was born but the other descended on him who was born and left him again, not one but two are indicated. But that the apostle knew one Christ Jesus, who was both born and who suffered, he says again in the same letter (15)

All the quotations go to prove the same point, that it is one Christ Jesus who both died and rose, not Jesus who died and Christ who rose.

The true grounds for Irenaeus's understanding of the unity of the person of Christ are soteriological. To express it in its briefest terms: Jesus Christ must be God to save, and he must be man to save man. This is eloquently expressed in the following passage:

Therefore, as we said before, he united man to God. For unless man had overcome the enemy of man the enemy would not have been justly defeated. And again, unless God had bestowed salvation, we would not have it securely. And unless man had been united with God, he could never have partaken of immortality. (16)

At the moment we are not concerned with Irenaeus's soteriology, which will be considered in the next section,

15. adv. haer. III xvi 9; H. ii 90; cf. III xviii 3; H. ii 97; Dem. 30

16. ἦνωσεν οὖν, καθὼς προέφαμεν, τὸν ἄνθρωπον τῷ θεῷ. Εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἄνθρωπος ἐνίκησεν τὴν ἀντίπαλον τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, οὐκ ἂν δικαίως ἐνικήθη ὁ ἐχθρός. Πάλιν τε εἰ μὴ ὁ θεὸς ἔδωρῃσατο τὴν σωτηρίαν, οὐκ ἂν βεβαίως ἔσχονεν αὐτήν. Καὶ εἰ μὴ συνηνώθη ἄνθρωπος τῷ θεῷ, οὐκ ἂν ἡδυνήθη μετέσχεῖν τῆς ἀφθαρσίας. adv. haer. III xviii 7; H. ii 100; Greek preserved by Theodoret, Dial. II.

but the essential paradox of the Christology is clearly apparent: the Saviour of man must be at once God and man. Irenaeus makes a similar point in discussing the right of Jesus to forgive sins (commenting on Matthew 9.2 - 8):

Therefore, forgiving sins, he indeed healed the man, and clearly showed who he himself was. For if no-one can forgive sins, except God alone, and yet the Lord remitted these (sins) and healed the man, it is obvious that he himself was the Word of God become Son of man, receiving from the Father the power to forgive sins since he was man and since he was God, so that, just as a man he suffers with us, and just as God he has mercy on us and forgives us our debts which we owe to God our maker. (17)

So far as Irenaeus is concerned, those who do not accept the humanity and the divinity of Christ can only be under the old condemnation. (18) The paradox of the humanity and the divinity is simply left to stand as a paradox without resolution, as can be seen, for a final example, in Irenaeus's comments on Isaiah 7.10 - 16, in which certain features indicate the humanity of him who is to be born of a virgin (the fact that he is to eat butter and honey; that he is described as an infant; that he does not yet know good and evil) and other features his divinity (that

17. adv. haer. V xvii 3; H. ii 371. We have followed the Latin text as emended in the light of the Armenian, which makes better sense. See the 'notes justificatives' in SC 152, p. 289. Cf. adv. haer. V xviii 3; H. ii 375.

18. adv. haer. III xviii 7; H. ii 101.

his name is Emmanuel; that he will renounce evil and choose good); but he is described as both 'so that we should not understand that he is only a mere man because he will eat butter and honey, nor on the other hand suspect him to be God without flesh because of the name Emmanuel.' (19)

Quite apart from the passages that refer to the unity of the humanity and divinity in one Christ, Irenaeus elsewhere insists on the real humanity and the real divinity. In the Demonstratio he again considers the same passage from Isaiah mentioned above, though this time it is only to prove the humanity of Christ. (20) Elsewhere, Irenaeus collects a number of references from the Psalms and other prophets to indicate the same point. (21) Even the very title 'Son of man' signifies for Irenaeus the real humanity of Jesus. (22) In his attack on Marcion

19. adv. haer. III xxi 4; H. ii 116.

20. Dem. 53.

21. adv. haer. IV xxxiii 12; H. ii 267.

22. The title 'Son of man' has undergone some changes between the period of the New Testament and Irenaeus. In the New Testament the title occurs, with one exception (Acts 7.56), only in the gospels, and is used there with a range of meanings that may conveniently be gathered under three heads: as a title of exaltation affirming the future, eschatological glory of the exalted and triumphant Son of Man (Mk 8.38 and parallels; Mk 13.26 and parallels; Mk 14.62 and parallels, with Acts 7.56; etc.); as a title in connection with the suffering of Jesus - the Son of man must suffer, etc. - (Mk 8.31 and parallel; Mk 9.12 and parallel; Mk 9.31 and parallels; Mk 10.33 and

Irenaeus asks: 'Why did Jesus acknowledge himself to be Son of man, if he had not gone through the birth that

22. (contd.) parallels; etc.); as a title of self-designation by Jesus in reference to his ministry (Mk 2.10 and parallels; Mt. 8.20 and parallel; Mt. 11.19 and parallel; Mt. 12.32 and parallel; etc.). The interpretation of this synoptic evidence is a much-debated issue that we cannot discuss here (See, e.g., O. Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, London, 1963, ch. 6; R.H. Fuller, The Foundations of New Testament Christology, London, 1965; H.E. Todt, The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition, ET London, 1965; F.H. Borsch, The Son of Man in Myth and History, ET London, 1967; C. Colpe, 'ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου', in TWNT, ET, Vol VIII, pp. 400 - 77, with an extensive bibliography). What is clear, however, is that the one title is used in connection with both the glory and the humiliation of Jesus; a view that John's gospel likewise bears out in a unique way by seeing the cross as the place of Jesus's glory. Hence the lifting up of the Son of man (Jn 3.14; 12.34; cf. 8.28; 12.23; 13.31) embraces both the humiliation and the glory. We are concerned here with only the title itself, and outside the New Testament we see the title becoming increasingly reserved for the humanity of Christ as distinct from the divinity. Traces of the 'heavenly' character of the Son of man still occur, however (in Hegesippus - in Eusebius, H.E. II 23.12f. and Justin Martyr, Dial. 31 (247D)), and in Gnosticism the title 'Son of Man' becomes closely associated with 'Man' the Aeon, and with speculation on the primal man and the Redeemer's relation to him (adv. haer. I xxx 1; H. i 226 - 28 - Ophites; adv. haer. I xii 3f.; H. i 112 - 14 - Marcus and others; adv. haer. I xv 3; H. i 150 - Marcus; Ev. Ph. para. 120; Heracleon, Frag. 35). In 'orthodox' circles, the title 'Son of man' becomes

belongs to man?' (23)

Just as forcefully Irenaeus emphasises the true divinity of Christ. Much of what he has to say on this point is set in a soteriological context: Only God can save man; man cannot save himself:

Therefore, for that reason the Lord himself gave⁽²⁴⁾ him who is Emmanuel from the virgin as the sign of our salvation, since it was the Lord himself who was saving them, because they were unable to be saved through their own efforts (quia per semetipsos non habebant salvari).⁽²⁵⁾

22. (contd.) involved in a concern for Christ's human nature. So Ignatius of Antioch sets the title 'Son of man' alongside the title 'Son of God', stressing the paradox of the humanity and divinity (Eph. 20.2). In Ps.-Barnabas the title is the equivalent of 'merely man' (Barn. 12.10). In Justin Martyr the title again refers to the humanity of Christ as distinct from his divinity (Dial. 76 (301A); 100 (327A)). Curiously enough, this same distinction occurs in the Valentinian treatise De Resurrectione (44.21 - 33). In Irenaeus the title refers to Christ as born of Mary - i.e. as man (Refs. in next note).
23. adv. haer. IV xxxiii 2; H. ii 257; cf. III x 2; H. ii 34; III xvi 3; H. ii 84; III xvi 5; H. ii 85f.; III xvi 7; H. ii 89; III xvii 1; H. ii 92; III xviii 3f.; H. ii 97; III xviii 6; H. ii 99; III xix 1 - 3; H. ii 202 - 04; III xxii 1; H. ii 121; IV xxxiii 11; H. ii 266; V xvii 3; H. ii 371; V xxi 1 - 3; H. ii 381 - 83; Dem. 1; 3; 36.
24. The Latin lacks a verb; Sagnard supplies 'dedit' and lists other suggested emendations in the apparatus, ad loc.
25. adv. haer. III xx 3; H. ii 107.

Consequently, those who consider that Jesus is simply the son of Joseph remain under the old enslavement and will die.⁽²⁶⁾ Irenaeus insists on the divinity of Christ because otherwise man cannot be saved. If the one who bound man was strong, then the one who defeats him must be stronger than man.⁽²⁷⁾

In spite of Irenaeus's refusal to speculate and his readiness to let a paradox remain a paradox, there are some hints of Irenaeus's more precise understanding of the relationship of the divine to the human in Christ. These hints are found mainly in a very complex passage:

ὡςπερ γὰρ ἦν ἄνθρωπος ἵνα πειρασθῇ οὕτω καὶ λόγος ἵνα δοξασθῇ. ἡσυχάζοντος μὲν τοῦ λόγου ἐν τῷ πειράζεσθαι, [ἐτιμάζεσθαι] καὶ σταυροῦσθαι, καὶ ἀποθνήσκειν. συγγινομένου δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐν τῷ νικᾶν, καὶ ὑπομένειν, καὶ χρηστεύεσθαι, καὶ ἀντίστασθαι καὶ ἀναλαμβάνεσθαι.⁽²⁸⁾

The passage presents two major problems. The first concerns the phrase: ἡσυχάζοντος μὲν τοῦ λόγου. The point here is not the departure of Christ from Jesus prior to the passion as the Gnostics maintained,⁽²⁹⁾ but the veiling of the divine glory and power in the Incarnation and life of Jesus.

26. adv. haer. III xix 1; H. ii 102.

27. adv. haer. IV xxxiii 4; H. ii 259.

28. adv. haer. III xix 3; H. ii 104. Greek preserved by Theodoret, Dial. III. The Latin and the Greek diverge at an important point to be discussed below.

29. Cf. adv. haer. III xvi 9; H. ii 90.

The 'silence' of the Word is linked to soteriology, as is plain in the following:

And therefore our Lord, in the last times, having summed up all things in himself, came to us, not as he could have but as we were able to see him (οὐχ ὥς αὐτὸς ἠδύνατο, ἀλλ' ὥς ἡμεῖς αὐτὸν ἰδεῖν ἠδυνάμεθα). For he could have come to us in his immortal glory, but we could never have endured the greatness of his glory. (30)

Irenaeus, then, does not follow the 'traditional' understanding as seen e.g. in Justin Martyr⁽³¹⁾ and to some extent in Melito of Sardis,⁽³²⁾ where the contrast is drawn between the humility and degradation of the coming in the Incarnation and the glory of the second coming. Irenaeus makes little use of this contrast, though some faint traces of it still remain.⁽³³⁾ For Irenaeus the essential contrast lies not in the two comings, but in the paradox of the person of Christ at once both God and man, glorious and humble.⁽³⁴⁾ In this lies the explanation for the

30. adv. haer. IV xxxviii 1; H. ii 293. Greek preserved by John of Damascus, Sacra Parallela.

31. See above, pp. 247ff.

32. Whereas Justin contrasts the two comings of Christ, Melito contrasts the humanity and divinity of Christ, but when he seeks for indisputable evidence of the humanity and the divinity he points to the periods before and after the Baptism of Christ (Frag. 6; see above, pp. 290ff.).

33. Notably in the association of the idea of humiliation with the coming in the Incarnation (e.g. adv. haer. IV xxxiii 12; H. ii 267).

34. Cf. 'La présence humaine se définit par référence au

'silence' of the Word.

The second problem concerns the phrase συγγινόμενου δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ. The Latin text is quite different at this point, having 'absorpto autem homine'. The question is, which represents the intention of Irenaeus? The extant Latin appears to be capable of a monophysite interpretation. There are two possible solutions: either Theodoret, to whom we owe the preservation of the Greek, has 'corrected' the text to avoid the possibility of a monophysite interpretation, or, if the extant Greek is the original text of Irenaeus, the Latin has been 'corrected' in a monophysite sense. In favour of the former, and therefore of the correctness of the Latin, Houssiau points out;⁽³⁵⁾ (1) Elsewhere, Theodoret appears to have 'corrected' a similar expression through a misunderstanding of the text;⁽³⁶⁾ (2) In another place Irenaeus speaks of absorption in

34. (contd.) Verbe, Fils de Dieu, et non par référence à une venue future et glorieuse du Christ' (Houssiau, op. cit., p. 126).

35. op. cit., pp. 191 - 95.

36. The Latin text of adv. haer. III xix 1; H. ii 103 reads 'commixtus Verbo Dei'. The Greek preserved by Theodoret reads τὸν λόγον χωρήσας. It is possible that Theodoret 'corrected' the text to avoid the possibility of Eutychianism; which, in fact, is not in question here since the subject of 'commixtus' is not Christ but man who is to be saved. See Houssiau, op. cit., p. 192; cf. the note of Harvey, ii 103, note 4.

connection with the work of Christ.⁽³⁷⁾ To this we may add (3): The extant Greek does not support what appears to be the logical structure of the sentence. The initial sentence: *ὡς ἐπεὶ γὰρ . . . ἵνα δοξασθῇ* contrasts the humanity and divinity, the humanity making possible the testing, the divinity the glorifying. There follows a *μὲν* clause which explains the role of the Word during the specifically human aspects of Christ's life. In the *δε* clause we would expect to find an explanation of the role of the humanity during the specifically divine activity. Instead, the extant Greek continues to discuss the role of the Word. The extant construction also leaves another problem in the very idea of the Word's association with the humanity. In a discussion of the triumph won by the Word we might expect to hear of the humanity being associated with the divinity, but not vice versa as here.⁽³⁸⁾

37. 'But how could we be united to incorruption and immortality unless incorruption and immortality had been made what we are, so that what is corruptible should be absorbed by incorruption and what is mortal by immortality (ut absorberetur quod erat corruptibile ab incorruptela et quod erat mortale ab immortalitate), so that we might receive the adoption of sons' (adv. haer. III xix 2; H. ii 103). Cf. also III xxii 3; H. ii 123.

38. Another solution to the problem has been to accept the Greek text but interpret *τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ* as mankind in general rather than the humanity of Christ (So Bonwetsch, op. cit., p. 110). But this does not fit in the context, which is a discussion of the humanity and divinity of Christ, even though it is consistent with the soteriological thought of Irenaeus.

If, then, we accept the Latin text as representing what Irenaeus meant, does it follow that he was in some way a precursor of monophysitism? Not at all. For it to be a question of monophysitism, we should expect some statement such as: the humanity was absorbed in the divinity. As Houssiau again points out, ⁽³⁹⁾ the contrast between the silence of the Word and the absorption of the humanity lies not in two different stages of the career of the Logos, as though the Word were silent during the Incarnation, and the humanity swallowed up once Christ was glorified, but in two different aspects of the one Christ. This is made quite clear by the inclusion of *ὑπομένειν* (sustinere) among those things in which the humanity is absorbed. The passage in question is simply the converse of the statement that the Word was silent in the humiliation etc., which is not a denial of the real divinity but indicates the veiling of the divine glory. In this converse it is the frailty of the humanity which is overshadowed, but not denied. ⁽⁴⁰⁾ Even the extant Latin does not support a monophysite interpretation. Rightly understood the passage as a whole upholds the paradox of the humanity and divinity in the one Christ. ⁽⁴¹⁾

39. op. cit., pp. 194f.

40. Cf. 'L'argument primitif ne signifie donc pas que le Verbe s'est retiré du Christ au moment de la passion, mais seulement qu'il a caché sa puissance ou sa gloire. Par ailleurs, *κατακρίνειν* ne signifiait pas l'absorption de l'homme dans la divinité, mais la disparition de la fragilité humaine' (Houssiau, op. cit., p. 195).

41. Cf. the comment of Irenaeus on the phrase 'In that day I will raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen'

In the end, we must with Irenaeus simply accept the paradoxical nature of the Incarnation: Jesus Christ is both God and man. Irenaeus does not speculate on how the paradox might be resolved, and the grounds for his emphasis on each of the points will become clearer when we move from the fact of the Incarnation to its place in the scheme of salvation history, for it is what the Incarnation made possible that most interests Irenaeus. However, what the Incarnation makes possible depends on what the Incarnation is, and hence the detail with which this latter has been examined here. Before we go on to consider the theme of Redemption we must briefly discuss the role of the Spirit in the Incarnation and the attitude of Irenaeus to the virgin birth.

The role of the Spirit in the Incarnation is, in the first place, as the power by which Jesus was born. Although Irenaeus does not quote either Matthew 1.18 and 20 or Luke 1.35 in order to prove that Jesus was conceived 'by the Holy Spirit', he finds proof of the same thing in three passages from the Old Testament. Commenting on Isaiah 49.5 ('And now thus saith the Lord, who formed me as his servant from the womb . . .'), Irenaeus says: 'For here, in the first place,

41. (contd.) (Amos 9.11); 'For in these passages, (he shows) both that he who according to the flesh was of the seed of David, the anointed, would be Son of God, and that after his death he would rise again, and that he would be in figure man, but in power God' (Dem. 62). Here again the point is the veiling of the power of the Word of God in the life of the incarnate Word, and there is no question either of docetism or any undermining of the real humanity.

we have seen that the Son of God was pre-existent, . . . and that the very God himself forms him from the womb, that is, that he would be born of the Spirit of God.'⁽⁴²⁾ And commenting on Isaiah 11.1 ('And there shall come forth a rod out of the roots of Jesse, and a flower from his root shall come forth') he says: 'And the "flower" refers to body; for it was made to bud forth by the Spirit.'⁽⁴³⁾ Finally, commenting on Lamentations 4.20 ('The spirit of our face is the Lord Christ; and how he was taken in their toils, of whom we said: under thy shadow shall we live among the Gentiles'), Irenaeus makes the following statements relating to the Incarnation: 'Scripture both tells that Christ, being Spirit of God, was to become a man subject to suffering, . . . and "shadow" means his body, for as a shadow is made by a body, so too Christ's body is made by his Spirit . . . He also named the body of Christ a "shadow" as having become a shade of the glory of the Spirit, covering him.'⁽⁴⁴⁾ In this last passage, apart from the point made above, that Christ's body is made by the Spirit, we may note another interesting feature, that Christ is referred to as 'Spirit of God', so that in some sense Christ was the agent of his

42. Dem. 51.

43. Dem. 59.

44. Dem. 71. Two interpretations of the last sentence are possible: 'He also named the body of Christ a "shadow" ', then, either: 'in that the Spirit overshadowed and covered it (or him) with glory'; or: 'as having become a shade for the glory of the Spirit, and covering him (or it).' See Smith, *op. cit.*, *ad loc.*, who prefers the latter.

Own Incarnation. (45)

Besides his role in the Incarnation itself, the Spirit is also poured out on Jesus in his ministry. In this connection Irenaeus several times makes use of Isaiah 11.2 with its reference to the Spirit. The following is typical: Therefore the Spirit of God in his indwelling is manifold, and is enumerated by Isaiah the prophet in the seven charismata resting on the Son of God, that is, the Word, in his coming as man. For he says: 'The Spirit of God shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and of understanding, the spirit of counsel and of fortitude, (the spirit of knowledge) and of godliness; the spirit of the fear of God shall fill him' (Is. 11.2). (46)

Irenaeus, however, does not leave the matter there; the

45. Cf. Ep. Apost. 3, and see above, ch. 4, note 13. The appearance of this idea in Irenaeus attests the fact that there was as yet no hard and fast division between the activity of the Spirit and the activity of the Word. This we have already seen in the context of creation (see above, pp. 568ff.), and in the context of Revelation in the Old Testament the same imprecision appears. Although the Word is the subject of the theophanies of the Old Testament (see above, pp. 568ff.) and addresses Adam after the fall (adv. haer. V xvii 1; H. ii 369) and gives the Law to Moses (adv. haer. IV ii 3; H. ii 148), etc., the Spirit also is said to guide the prophets (adv. haer. IV xi 1; H. ii 174; IV ii 4; H. ii 148; IV xxvii 1; H. ii 239; Dem. 2; 6; 24; 26; 30; 42; 49; etc.), and in one passage Irenaeus even speaks of 'the Spirit of Christ, who also spoke in the other prophets about him' (Dem. 73).

46. Dem. 9; The phrase 'the spirit of knowledge' has clearly been omitted by accident as the allocation of

Spirit does not simply rest on Jesus. Again the true setting is soteriological, as appears most clearly in the following passage, in which Irenaeus argues that, contrary to the idea of Ptolemaeus that Christ descends on Jesus, it is in fact the Spirit who descends on Jesus:

(God) promised through the prophets that in the last time he would pour out the Spirit on his servants and handmaids that they might prophesy (Joel 3.1f.). Wherefore he descended on the Son of God made Son of man, becoming accustomed with him to dwell in the human race, and to rest on men, and to dwell in God's handiwork, carrying out the will of the Father in these and renewing them from old age to the newness of Christ. (47)

Jesus, then, receives the Spirit in order to bestow it on man.

The connection between the Incarnation and the fact that it is through Jesus that the Spirit comes to dwell with men appears very clearly in the following:

(Christ) 'was seen on earth and conversed with men' (Baruch 3.37) joining and uniting the Spirit of God the Father with what God had fashioned, so that man became according to the image and likeness of God. (48)

This 'joining and uniting' takes place essentially in the

46. (contd.) each of the seven qualities to a separate heaven later in the same chapter indicates. Cf. adv. haer. III ix 3; H. ii 32f.; III xi 6; H. ii 45; III xii 7; H. ii 61.

47. adv. haer. III xvii 1; H. ii 92f.; cf. III ix 3; H. ii 32f.; III xvii 3; H. ii 93; Dem. 47; 53.

48. Dem. 97.

Incarnation of the Word, 'on whom rested the Spirit of God, united with his body.' (49) What must be noted here, however, is that it is not the possession of the Spirit that establishes the divinity of Christ. He is divine because he is the Word of God, and it is on Jesus, as the incarnate Word, that the Spirit descends. The Spirit is bestowed on Jesus so that the Spirit might become accustomed to dwelling among men and that Jesus might bestow the Spirit on those who believe in him. The dove that descends on Jesus at his baptism signifies the descent of the Spirit on Jesus, not the descent of Christ. (50) For Irenaeus the very name 'Christ' indicates that the Spirit rests upon and fills the incarnate Word, 'for in the name of Christ is implied he who anoints, he who is anointed and the unction itself with which he is anointed. And indeed the Father anointed, but the Son was anointed with the Spirit, which is the unction; as the Word declares through Isaiah: "the spirit of God is on me, because he has anointed me" (Is. 61.1), indicating the anointing Father, the anointed Son and the unction, which is the Spirit.' (51) The term 'Christ' is, therefore, strictly speaking applicable only to the

49. Dem. 41. Irenaeus's precise meaning here is difficult to determine, but close union of the Spirit with the creation by means of the Incarnation is beyond doubt. See Froidevaux, op. cit., ad loc.

50. adv. haer. III ix 3; H. ii 32.

51. adv. haer. III xviii 3; H. ii 97; cf. Dem. 53.

incarnate Word, not to the pre-existent Word. Jesus is Jesus Christ (= anointed) because he is anointed with the Spirit.⁽⁵²⁾

On the question of the Virgin Birth of Jesus Irenaeus was again in conflict with the Gnostics. In Irenaeus's account of the Gnostics two different attitudes to the Virgin Birth emerge, though the ultimate effect, so far as Irenaeus was concerned, was the same. The two attitudes both begin from the contention that redemption is primarily from and not of this world; the Redeemer cannot, therefore, have any essential relationship with this created order. From this, Cerinthus, for example, maintained that Jesus was simply the son of Mary and Joseph, and on him the heavenly Christ descended at his baptism.⁽⁵³⁾ Others, while not specifically denying the Virgin Birth, maintained that Jesus passed through Mary 'like water through a tube'.⁽⁵⁴⁾ On this 'docetic' Jesus the heavenly Christ again descends at his baptism.⁽⁵⁵⁾ In both cases, according to Irenaeus, the ultimate effect is the same: 'According to no opinion of the heretics was the Word made flesh.'⁽⁵⁶⁾

52. See especially Houssiau, *op. cit.*, pp. 166 - 86; who traces the use of the name 'Christ' prior to Irenaeus.

53. *adv. haer.* I xxvi 1; H. i 211f.

54. *adv. haer.* I vii 2; H. i 60.

55. On Valentinian theories about the Incarnation (or, better, the descent of the Saviour, since it can scarcely be called Incarnation) see above, pp. 434 - 57.

56. *adv. haer.* III xi 3; H. ii 42; cf. III xvi 1f.; H. ii 82f.; V i 2f.; H. ii 316.

The Gnostic denial of the real Incarnation, seen in their understanding of the Virgin Birth, is attacked strongly by Irenaeus on two counts. In the first place, redemption means redemption of the world, and therefore the Redeemer must show clearly his close affinity with the world he has come to save. For Irenaeus this is primarily to be seen in the fact that the Word becomes incarnate of the Virgin Mary. Although this likeness does not, strictly speaking, require a virgin birth, Irenaeus uses the Virgin Birth to emphasise the likeness of the Word to the man he has come to save.⁽⁵⁷⁾ Just as Adam was made from the virgin earth, so the Word takes his birth from the Virgin Mary;⁽⁵⁸⁾ just as sin came into the world through man who was born from the virgin earth, so salvation of that man came into the world by birth from the Virgin Mary.⁽⁵⁹⁾ Against the idea that Jesus 'passed through' Mary, Irenaeus insists that if Jesus took nothing from Mary, there can be no recapitulation or salvation of the original creation.⁽⁶⁰⁾ This leads us straight to one of the major themes of the next section: the close link in salvation history between the original creation and its redemption in Christ.

57. The significance of this for salvation history and redemption will be considered in the next section.

See adv. haer. III xxii 1; H. ii 121; V xxi 1; H. ii 381; Dem. 33.

58. adv. haer. III xxi 10; H. ii 120; Dem. 32; cf. Ev. Ph. para. 83.

59. adv. haer. III xviii 7; H. ii 101f.

60. adv. haer. III xxii 2; H. ii 122.

In Irenaeus's second line of attack on the Gnostic views of the Virgin Birth the birth itself as birth from a virgin becomes more important. We have already seen that, against the Gnostics, Irenaeus maintains the continuity of the divine action, particularly with reference to the links between what was foretold by the prophets and what was fulfilled in Christ. This applies to the birth of Christ as much as to any other aspect of his life and work. Hence because Isaiah had said that Emmanuel would be born of a virgin (at least that was how Irenaeus understood the text - Is. 7.14), then this must, of necessity, be fulfilled in Christ.⁽⁶¹⁾ Furthermore, the very unusual nature of the birth makes it both as prophecy and as fulfilment a sure sign that it is God's work,⁽⁶²⁾ an idea that is in essence repeated in Irenaeus's interpretation of 'the stone hewn without hands' (Dan. 2.34).⁽⁶³⁾ In the light of this, there is no doubt in Irenaeus's mind that the text of Isaiah must be 'virgin' and not simply 'young woman'.⁽⁶⁴⁾

Irenaeus also links the Virgin Birth with the

61. adv. haer. IV xxxiii 11; H. ii 266; cf. III xxi 4; H. ii 116; III xvi 3; H. ii 84; IV xxiii 1; H. ii 230.
62. adv. haer. III xix 1; H. ii 102; III xix 3; H. ii 105; III xx 3; H. ii 107; III xxi 6; H. ii 118.
63. adv. haer. III xxi 7; H. ii 118; cf. V xxvi 1f.; H. ii 395.
64. adv. haer. III xxi 1; H. ii 110. Irenaeus's attack here appears to be specifically directed at Theodotion, whose translation of the Old Testament appeared in 181 AD, and Aquila, whose translation had appeared c. 129 AD, both of whom use *παρθένης* not *παιθίς* (LXX).

fulfilment of God's promise to David that one of his descendants should sit on his throne: Matthew relates the birth of Jesus Christ from the Virgin, 'just as God promised David that he would raise up an eternal king from the fruit of his belly (*ex fructu ventris eius excitaturum se aeternum Regem*).'(65) The argument depends on the fact that the underlying Greek clearly indicated *κοιλίας*, which implies female reproductive organs not male, and hence implies virgin birth. The force of the argument is retained by the Latin 'venter'.(66)

The Incarnation is a paradox, but without it there can be no salvation. The speculation that can arise out of the paradox is not Irenaeus's concern. His concern is the redemption that the Incarnation makes possible. In this section we have been attempting to draw more precisely the lines of Irenaeus's Christology in order to avoid having to interrupt the next section in which the threads of salvation history come together in the work of the incarnate Word; and yet it is in the salvation history that Irenaeus's Christology finds its proper place:

And if anyone accept not his virgin birth, how shall he accept his resurrection from the dead? For it is

65. adv. haer. III xvi 2; H. ii 82f.; cf. III ix 2; H. ii 31; Dem. 36.

66. See also adv. haer. III xxi 5; H. ii 117, where the argument is presented most fully. Irenaeus also uses the genealogy in Matthew to prove Christ's descent from David, but without reference to the Virgin Birth (Frag. XXVII; H. ii 493).

nothing marvellous, nothing astonishing, nothing unheard-of, if one who was not born rose from the dead - but we cannot even speak of the 'resurrection' of one who came into being without birth, for he who is not born is also immortal; and he who was not subject to birth will not be subject to death either; for how can one who did not take on man's beginning receive his end?

So, if he was not born, neither did he die; and if he did not die, neither was he raised from the dead; and if he was not raised from the dead, he has not conquered death, nor is its reign abolished; and if death is not conquered, how are we to mount on high into life, being subject from the beginning to death?⁽⁶⁷⁾

V REDEMPTION

With this section, we come to the heart of Irenaeus's theology and his Christology and the centre-point on which the whole of his Christocentric salvation history hangs, the real corner-stone of all his theology: What was done for man in the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. In order to make the plan of this long section more readily appreciated, we have divided the subject of redemption into four sub-headings: Man in need of Redemption; the Redemptive Act; Man Redeemed; Recapitulation. The concept of recapitulation has been left to the end as a separate sub-section

67. Dem. 38f. At the end of the first paragraph we have followed the construction favoured by Smith, Froidevaux and Weber; Robinson, Wilson and Barthoulot favour 'For one who is unborn and immortal, and has not undergone birth . . .'

partly because its importance in the writings of Irenaeus warrants treating it by itself, and partly because it serves as a useful theme with which to draw together the diverse threads of this section.

Man in Need of Redemption:

To grasp Irenaeus's understanding of the work of Christ and its place in salvation history it is necessary to go back again to the creation and the conditions that made the work necessary at all, for there are several strands of thought that are followed through by Irenaeus in salvation history, and these can all be traced to the state of man at the beginning and how man came to be in need of redemption.

We have already seen that in the creation man is made in the image of God and that this means more specifically in the image of the Son.⁽¹⁾ We must now examine this more closely. Genesis 1.26, on which the doctrine of man's similarity to God is based, speaks of man's being in the image and likeness of God. In general, when speaking of man's similarity to God Irenaeus retains the doublet of Genesis 1.26, 'image and likeness',⁽²⁾ but on occasion he distinguishes between them. When Irenaeus does so, the 'image', as distinct from the 'likeness' is, so to speak, God's 'Trade Mark' on man as a creature:

But man he fashioned with his own hands, taking of the purest and finest of earth, in measured wise mingling with the earth his own power; for he gave his frame the outline of his own form, that the

1. Dem. 22. See above, pp. 582f.

2. e.g. adv. haer. V xv 3; H. ii 366; Dem. 55.

visible appearance too should be godlike - for it was as an image of God that man was fashioned and set on earth - and that he might come to life, he 'breathed into his face the breath of life,' (Gen. 2.7), so that the man became like God in inspiration as well as in frame.⁽³⁾

It is precisely in his fleshly creatureliness that man is in the image of God. The significance of this with regard to the fact that man is made after the image of God and that the image of God is the Son is that even in the creation of man from the earth Irenaeus looks forward to the Incarnation when the true image is revealed: Man at his creation was modelled on the future incarnate Word.⁽⁴⁾

The 'image', then, designates man as a creature formed from the earth by God, but the 'likeness' is a quality that comes to man through God's activity on his behalf,⁽⁵⁾ and in this we have the basis for the idea of man's growth and development, and hence also a basis for salvation history:

But God will be glorified in his handiwork, making it similar and corresponding to his Son (conforme illud et consequens suo puero adaptans). For by the hands of the Father, that is, the Son and the Spirit, man is made according to the image and likeness of God.⁽⁶⁾

3. Dem. 11.

4. Cf. 'Adam wurde typus futuri, d.h. er wurde das Abbild des zukünftigen neuen Menschen, des zweiten Adam, Christus' (Joppich, op. cit., p. 81, and see pp. 81 - 83).

5. This in no way means that the 'likeness' is the divine part in man in contrast to the human 'image'; both image and likeness belong to man as a creature. See Wingren, op. cit., p. 158.

6. adv. haer. V vi 1; H. 11 333. The words 'image and'

Here we can see clearly the idea of man's growing conformity to the 'likeness', a conformity brought about by the Son and the Spirit. The point is given the clearest possible presentation in the following passage:

In times past it used to be said that man was made in the image of God, but it was not displayed; for as yet the Word of God was invisible, after whose image man was made (ἔτι, γὰρ ἀόρατος ἦν ὁ Λόγος, οὐ κατ' εἰκόνα ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐγένοντο). And therefore he easily lost the likeness. But when the Word of God became flesh he ratified both (τὰ ἀμφοτέρω ἐπεκύρωσεν), for he both displayed the image truly (τὴν εἰκόνα ἔδειξεν ἀληθῶς), having become what his image was (αὐτὸς τοῦτο γενόμενος ὅπερ ἦν ἡ εἰκὼν αὐτοῦ), and he also established the likeness securely (καὶ τὴν ὁμοίωσιν βεβαίως κατέστησε), having made man like the invisible Father through the visible Word (συνεξομοιώσας τὸν ἄνθρωπον τῷ ἀοράτῳ πατρὶ διὰ τοῦ βλεπομένου λόγου).⁽⁷⁾

Primarily the 'likeness' signifies immortality and incorruption.⁽⁸⁾

Here then is the first theme of man's condition that will be taken up again in man's redemption, for which the period of the Old Testament was a preparation. Man was indeed created 'secundum imaginem et similitudinem Dei', but the 'imago' is not clear and the 'similitudo' has been

6. (contd.) are an addition in emendation; see the 'notes justificatives' in SC 152, pp. 226f.

7. adv. haer. V xvi 2; H. ii 368. Greek preserved by John of Damascus, Sacra Parallela.

8. adv. haer. IV xxxviii 3; H. ii 296.

lost. However, as was observed above, this distinction (9) between the image and the likeness is not rigidly maintained, and except where Irenaeus wishes to draw the distinction for the point he is making at the time, he is content to speak of man's being created 'in the image and likeness of God'.

For Irenaeus, perfect man is not to be found apart from his creaturely status, but is this created man of the earth brought to perfection by God. Perfect man is tripartite, consisting of body, soul and spirit, (10) and it is not only one part of man that is eventually to be

9. adv. haer. IV pf. 4; H. ii 145 (likeness given in creation, though context of salvation is not absent); IV xxxiii 4; H. ii 259 (likeness in creation and shown in Incarnation); III xviii 1; H. ii 95 (image and likeness both in Adam).
10. The tripartite nature of man, consisting of body, soul and spirit, is clear in the following passages: adv. haer. II xxxiii 5; H. i 380; V i 1; H. ii 315; V vi 1; H. ii 333ff. (cited above); V ix 1; H. ii 342; V xii 2; H. ii 350f. From these it is clear that body and soul together are the natural man and the addition of the Spirit effects the spiritual man. That the natural man is bipartite is borne out by Irenaeus's discussion of the relation between the soul and the body (II xxxiii 1 - 4). The same bipartite distinction occurs again in IV pf. 4; H. ii 145 and Dem. 2, where the salvation of the whole man through participation in the Spirit is not under discussion. One passage appears to speak of redeemed man as bipartite, consisting of flesh and the spirit which redeems the flesh (V ix 2; H. ii 342f.). However, the difference here is accounted for by the fact that Irenaeus is commenting on Mt. 26.41 (*caro infirma, spiritus promptus*) and for

brought to the likeness of God, but the whole man, as the continuation of a passage quoted above makes clear. Having said that man is made according to the image and likeness of God by the hands of God, Irenaeus continues:

But not a part of man. Now the soul and the spirit can certainly be a part of man, but by no means (simply) man. Perfect man consists in the mixing and uniting of the soul receiving the spirit of the Father, together with the flesh which is fashioned according to the image of God (*perfectus autem homo commixtio et adunitio est animae assumptis spiritum Patris, et admixta ei carni, quae est plasmata secundum imaginem Dei*).⁽¹¹⁾

The point is elaborated in the succeeding paragraphs:

Neither the flesh by itself, nor the soul by itself, nor the spirit by itself can be described as man, 'but the mixing (*συγκρασις*) and uniting of all these produces the perfect man'.⁽¹²⁾ As we shall see⁽¹³⁾ the Spirit is poured out by Christ, thus enabling man to attain his perfection.⁽¹⁴⁾

Apart from his intended likeness to God, man is also 'like' God in some other respects, the most important of which is man's free-will. Man's freedom of choice is

10. (contd.) that reason adopts a bipartite division of man in his comments. See M. Spanneut Le Stoïcisme des pères de l'Église, pp. 143 - 50.

11. adv. haer. V vi 1; H. ii 333.

12. adv. haer. V vi 1; H. ii 334f. Greek partially preserved by the Jena papyrus (*συγκρα[σις . . .]*).

13. See above, pp. 612 - 15 , and below, pp. 675 - 77.

14. On the role of the Spirit in the Irenaeian anthropology see A. d'Alès, 'La doctrine de l'Esprit en saint Irénée', in RSR 14(1924), pp. 497 - 538, esp. pp. 502ff.

fundamental and original. Man 'was free, and his own master, having been made by God in order to be master of everything on earth.'⁽¹⁵⁾ Moreover, it was man's free-will that led him into his present condition, so that some men bring forth grain, others chaff, and man has become opposed to God and a slave to lusts.⁽¹⁶⁾ Man also retains his free-will in respect of the gospel, he can accept it or reject it.⁽¹⁷⁾ The emphasis that Irenaeus places on man's free-will stems in part from his opposition to the determinism of Valentinian Gnosticism, in which some men were predestined for salvation and others for damnation. But man's free-will is also an integral part of salvation history: it led to man's fall, and, more important, salvation history is not the record of God's manipulation of man, but of his saving work on man's behalf and of man's free response to that work. Irenaeus insists that man can choose.⁽¹⁸⁾

15. Dem. 11.

16. adv. haer. IV iv 3; H. ii 154.

17. adv. haer. IV xxxvii 4; H. ii 288f.

18. adv. haer. IV xxxvii 1; H. ii 285. This and the preceding reference both come from what Loofs (following Bousset) identifies as a treatise on free-will, one of Irenaeus's sources (Loofs equates this with IQT). Despite the fact that Irenaeus may be using source material at this point, it is no foreign body in his argument, for the education of man in history (the subject of the context in which the source is placed) is only possible where man is free. See Bengsch, *op. cit.*, pp. 136 - 39.

The perfection of man according to the image and likeness of God lies in the future, and this means that man must grow. Here we reach one of the essential features of salvation history in Irenaeus. The activity of God in history is matched on man's side by his increasing readiness for the coming of the Word of God in the Incarnation, and later, by his continued growth in the Church to the stature of perfect manhood, a goal achieved only at the consummation. Man must grow, 'therefore, they are totally without reason, who do not expect a time of growth (*tempus augmenti*). . . . But we hold it against him (*sc. God*) that we were not made gods from the beginning, but first men, then finally gods. . . . But it was right that at first nature should appear, then afterwards be overcome, and the mortal be swallowed up by immortality and the corruptible by incorruptibility, and man become in the image and likeness of God, receiving knowledge of good and evil.'⁽¹⁹⁾ This idea of growth is applied not only to the growth of each individual but to the whole human race as well. Man is on a path that leads from his first creation to God himself. In this Irenaeus differs from Theophilus in setting the idea of growth within the context of salvation history.⁽²⁰⁾

The logical conclusion of the idea of man's growth is

19. adv. haer. IV xxxviii 4; H. ii 297. On the whole theme of man's growth cf. also G.N. Bonwetsch, 'Der Gedanke der Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts bei Irenäus', in ZSTh 1(1923), pp. 637 - 49.

20. See above, pp. 260 - 65.

that man was a child at the outset, and this is in fact stated at several points in both works of Irenaeus. When the Lord made the earth he made the creatures perfect, 'while the lord, that is, the man, was a little one; for he was a child and had need to grow so as to come to his full perfection.'⁽²¹⁾ The idea of man's initial child-like state is most fully developed in reply to the query: Could not God have made man perfect at the beginning? Irenaeus does not really answer the question, but asserts that God could have done so (thus maintaining God's absolute sovereignty), but man could not have sustained it, 'for he was a child'.⁽²²⁾ The idea of man's growth is fundamental to Irenaeus's conception of salvation history.

The first theme of the creation of man which will be taken up again in the redemption of man is the idea that man was created in the image and likeness of God. Initially this image and likeness is not perfect in man for he is a child; he is, however, to grow and so attain the perfection for which he was created. The connection between creation and redemption established in the theme of the image and likeness becomes part of salvation history because of the time factor implied in the idea of growth. Thus Irenaeus has gone beyond the polemical requirement of showing the link between creation and redemption, and has set the whole

21. Dem. 12

22. adv. haer. IV xxxviii 1; H. ii 292f.; see also the subsequent sections where the point is re-iterated several times.

question in his own theological perspective of salvation history.

There are two other themes which arise out of the first and which have made it impossible for man simply to grow towards his perfection. From what we have adduced so far, there is nothing to suggest that the Incarnation will do more than show man his true image and likeness so that he may be able to exercise his free-will better. This first theme, however, must not be seen in isolation from all that Irenaeus has to say about man and his condition. For, far more serious are the circumstances that brought about the need of redemption rather than just a demonstration of man's true image and likeness. In brief, the circumstances concern man's child-like state, for while in that state man was seduced by Satan and disobeyed God, and these are the other two themes that will be taken up in the work of redemption: man's seduction and man's disobedience. The two are, of course, closely linked, but, on occasion, particularly when dealing with the redemptive complement, Irenaeus considers only one side of the seduction and subsequent disobedience, and that justifies the distinction here. (23)

23. In effect, then, there are two major themes, of which the second has itself two parts (man's seduction and man's disobedience). The two major themes do not lend themselves to complete assimilation into one coherent system; to do so is inevitably to reduce the significance of one or other of them. In particular, if the theme of man's growth is made normative then the Fall tends to be understood as part of the divine plan for

In Irenaeus's opinion, much of the blame for man's condition belongs to Satan who first induced man to disobey God. Satan's motive was envy of the great gifts that God had given to man, ⁽²⁴⁾ and out of that envy he persuaded man to disobey God, by offering man immortality, which was in fact not in his power to give; but this brought death on man. ⁽²⁵⁾ Satan's task of seduction was the easier because man was still a child, with, as yet, 'his discretion still undeveloped'. ⁽²⁶⁾ Having tricked man into disobedience, and consequently into death, ⁽²⁷⁾ Satan continued to hold man in his power. But his power is that of a usurper; Satan has no right to rule man at all. In fact he overstepped his proper authority when he led man astray.

23. (contd.) man (Cf. 'This view of life, moral and spiritual, as educational . . . is the very backbone of the system of Irenaeus's anthropology. . . . So much so, that the disobedience of man, . . . assumes a teleological significance in this system.' Hitchcock, op. cit., p. 59; cf. 'Irenaeus will aber den Fall völlig in den Heilsplan einbeziehen.' G.T. Armstrong, Die Genesis in der Alten Kirche. Die drei Kirchenväter, Tübingen, 1962, p. 87; cf. also O. Cullmann, Christ and Time, p. 57, n. 10). In fact the Fall does not destroy God's plan for man, but it was no original part of the plan. With his double theme, what Irenaeus wishes to maintain is: (1) Man must grow to perfection; (2) Man disobeyed God; (3) Man was led into his disobedience.
24. adv. haer. IV xl 3; H. ii 303; V xxiv 4; H. ii 390; Dem. 16.
25. adv. haer. III xxiii 1; H. ii 125; IV pf. 4; H. ii 145.
26. Dem. 12.
27. See below, pp. 631 - 33.

However that may be, he now has man in his power and has chained him to disobedience and rebellion.⁽²⁸⁾ Because it was Satan who led man astray, the heaviest wrath of God falls on him, with the attendant idea that it comes on the serpent so that it may fall the less heavily on man.⁽²⁹⁾

Although Satan led man astray and therefore bears much of the responsibility for man's condition, not all the blame attaches to him. Man, as we saw above, had been endowed by God with free-will and in the exercise of that will he yielded to the blandishments of Satan and disobeyed God.⁽³⁰⁾ Man is therefore also responsible for his own condition. The disobedience of man is complementary to the seduction of Satan, as is clearly seen in Irenaeus's exegesis of the parable of the wheat and the tares (Matthew 13.24 - 30, 36 - 43). Satan sowed tares in God's world, for which God cast him out of his presence; 'but on man, who carelessly, but without evil intent ($\alpha\mu\epsilon\lambda\omega\varsigma \mu\epsilon\nu \alpha\lambda\lambda' \alpha\kappa\alpha\kappa\omega\varsigma$), became engaged in disobedience, he had mercy.'⁽³¹⁾ While this is clearly not a strong statement of man's culpability, man was 'careless', and the theme of disobedience receives

28. adv. haer. V xxi 3; H. ii 383; cf. V i 1; H. ii 315.

29. adv. haer. III xxiii 5; H. ii 128; cf. III xxiii 3; H. ii 126; V xxi 2; H. ii 383; Dem. 16.

30. adv. haer. IV iv 3; H. ii 154; cf. IV xxxix 1; H. ii 298.

31. adv. haer. IV xl 3; H. ii 302f. Greek preserved in the Catena in Matthaeum. The Armenian agrees with the Greek against the Latin 'sed male', ($\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha \kappa\alpha\kappa\omega\varsigma$).

somewhat greater emphasis in the Demonstratio. There it is seen that the transgression of man was disobedience to a command of God, which had been given to man as a constant reminder of his creatureliness and as a guard against pride.⁽³²⁾ The command not to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was not a prohibition of moral discernment, but a simple test of man's obedience; and man disobeyed.⁽³³⁾

Although Adam is sorry for what he has done,⁽³⁴⁾ and even wears fig leaves to prove his penitence (they being the most uncomfortable leaves he could find, according to Irenaeus)⁽³⁵⁾, man has now brought on himself the condition that will require the saving activity of God in Christ. Because man was penitent, and because he had been led astray God determined to have mercy on man, 'for God hated him who led man astray, but on him who had been led astray he had pity gradually and little by little (sensim paulatimque).'⁽³⁶⁾ In the last phrase we see again the way in which this theme too is tied in with the concept of growth and salvation history.

The first steps that God takes out of his pity for man do not, at least at first sight, seem like acts of pity: God causes man to die; he casts him out of Paradise; and he

32. Dem. 15.

33. Dem. 15f.

34. adv. haer. III xxiii 5; H. ii 128.

35. ibid.

36. adv. haer. III xxiii 5; H. ii 128.

curses the ground. All these things, however, Irenaeus interprets as signs of mercy. Death was the result of disobedience, (37) but God acted in this for man's good: God removed man far from the tree of life 'so that he should not remain a sinner for ever, nor the sin surrounding him immortal, and evil endless and incurable. But he put an end to his transgression by interposing death and making sin cease; putting an end to it by the dissolution of the flesh, which happens in the earth; so that ceasing at last to live to sin and dying to it man might begin to live to God. (38) Man is thrown out of Paradise, 'because the

37. 'Inobedientia enim Dei mortem infert' - adv. haer. V xxiii 1; H. ii 387.

38. adv. haer. III xxiii 6; H. ii 128f.; cf. V xv 2; H. ii 365. The passage above is somewhat misleading, for it draws a distinction between sin which is clearly ethical and death which is physical. In fact, in Irenaeus, sin and death are much closer, and sin means essentially death. This appears most clearly in Dem. 31 where Irenaeus seeks to prove the true manhood of Christ by showing that Christ had to come in the same flesh as that in which Adam disobeyed. Through Adam's disobedience death came to rule over the body. But then Irenaeus goes on: 'So "the Word was made flesh," in order that sin, destroyed by means of that same flesh through which it had gained the mastery and taken hold and lorded it, should no longer be in us.' 'Sinful flesh' means, therefore, primarily not 'ethically corrupt' but conveys rather the idea of sinful flesh as dead flesh. On this close link between sin and death see Joppich, op. cit., pp. 95 - 101.

Garden does not admit a sinner', (39) and the ground is cursed by God in order that the curse of God should not remain on man, for if it did, man would perish utterly, and yet if no punishment were meted out, man would despise God. (40) As a final direct result of their disobedience Adam and Eve become aware of sexual desire. (41)

The three themes of man's development, man's defeat and man's disobedience provide the setting for man's need of salvation, and each of these themes will return in connection with the work of Christ. (42) Between the creation and the Incarnation God has been preparing man for the coming Incarnation of the Word, but on the other hand man has become accustomed to the bonds of his slavery, which serves to heighten the significance of Christ's redemptive work. (43) Man is even a son of the devil to the extent that he does the devil's work. (44) Adam's disobedience and defeat have their effect on the whole human race; man

39. Dem. 16.

40. adv. haer. III xxiii 3; H. ii 126.

41. adv. haer. III xxiii 5; H. ii 128; cf. III xxii 3; H. ii 123; Dem. 14.

42. By speaking of three themes we avoid the suggestion that the second and third are simply to be subsumed under the first, and the Fall reduced to a merely pedagogical episode in man's development. See above, note 23.

43. adv. haer. IV xiii 2; H. ii 182.

44. adv. haer. IV xli 2; H. ii 305.

has a solidarity in Adam. This is in particular emphasised in connection with man's solidarity in Christ in redemption. If Adam's defeat means our captivity, then our release must mean release for Adam as well;⁽⁴⁵⁾ just as in Adam we disobeyed, so in Christ we obeyed;⁽⁴⁶⁾ if Adam is not saved by Christ's redemptive work, then no-one at all is saved.⁽⁴⁷⁾

The seriousness of man's condition, which does not emerge from the theme of man's development and growth, receives its full emphasis in the themes of man's defeat and disobedience. Man is now in a state from which he cannot escape by his own efforts; God alone can save man now:

For because it was not possible for the man who had once been overcome and destroyed through disobedience to refashion himself and obtain the prize of victory; and as it was also impossible that he who had fallen under sin should achieve salvation, the Son effected both of these.⁽⁴⁸⁾

The Redemptive Act:

In the discussion of the activity of the Word in

45. adv. haer. III xxiii 2; H. ii 125.

46. adv. haer. V xvi 3; H. ii 368f.

47. adv. haer. III xxiii 8; H. ii 130.

48. adv. haer. III xviii 2; H. ii 95; cf. 'ipse dominus erat qui salvabat eos, quia per semetipsos non habebant salvari' - III xx 3; H. ii 107.

creation and the Old Testament revelation, (49) we emphasised that the work of the Word must be seen in the context of the unity of God; it is one God who is active in all creation and revelation. The same is true of redemption; there is one God who is active in the work of man's redemption, and the redemptive activity of Christ must be set in the context of the total work of God and his purposes for man. Already we have seen in man's condition that there is another aspect to man's state than his alienation from God through his seduction by Satan and his disobedience; man was a child who was to grow. The change in man's condition that was brought about by Christ in his life, death and resurrection affects all three of the themes we have outlined above, and all three themes must be set in the overall purposes of God.

God was not under any obligation to create man, but had done so 'in order that he might have someone on whom to bestow his kindnesses.' (50) God's original purpose was the establishment of a communion between himself and man. (51) Before the Fall, the Word walked with man in Paradise and

49. See above, pp. 575ff., and 583f.

50. adv. haer. IV xiv 1; H. ii 184.

51. As Joppich has shown (op. cit., pp. 47ff.) in the very use of 'plasma' to describe man in relation to God, Irenaeus expresses God's care and concern for what he has fashioned: 'Im Ausdruck suum plasma ist für Irenäus das ganze Geheimnis der göttlichen Liebe zum Menschengeschlecht enthalten; denn wie kann Gott je dessen vergessen, was er mit so viel liebender Sorgfalt ins Leben gerufen hat?' (p. 48).

talked with him, 'prefiguring what was to come to pass in the future; that is, that he would dwell with him and talk with him, and should be with men, teaching them righteousness.'(52) So the Incarnation is part of God's plan from the beginning.

After the Fall, God's ultimate purpose was not changed, and out of love for man he set out to redeem man. This love provides the whole basis of the entire salvation history and there is ample evidence to show that Irenaeus considered that God ordained all things for man's salvation:

Indeed God showed long-suffering in man's apostasy God determining everything for man's perfection and for the effectiveness and revelation of the arrangements (*praefiniente Deo omnia ad hominis perfectionem et ad efficaciam et manifestationem dispositionum*), so that both goodness may be shown and righteousness perfected, and the Church made to conform to the image of his Son, and in the end man become mature, in such ways coming to perfection to see and comprehend God (*et tandem aliquando maturus fiat homo, in tantis maturescens ad videndum et capiendum Deum*). (53)

So also, commenting on the story of Jonah, Irenaeus perceived that God had allowed man to be swallowed by a whale, in a manner of speaking, 'not so that, being swallowed up he should utterly perish, but arranging and preparing the plan of salvation (*sed praestruens et praeparens adinventionem salutis*), which was effected by the Word

52. *Dem.* 12; cf. *adv. haer.* IV xx 4; H. ii 215f.

53. *adv. haer.* IV xxxvii 7; H. ii 291; cf. V xxix 1; H. ii

through the sign of Jonah.' (54) So too the whole period of the Old Testament is an example of the way God has been preparing his salvation:

Thus, at the beginning, God formed man on account of his gifts; but he chose the patriarchs for the sake of their salvation, and prepared a people beforehand, teaching the intractable to follow God; and he made ready the prophets, accustoming man on earth to bear his Spirit and have communion with God. (55)

So too with regard to the Law, by which God was 'preparing man for his (God's) friendship, and for harmony with his neighbour.' (56) The Law was bondage, but it was a bondage that was intended to lead man and prepare him for the perfect revelation in Christ, 'for the Law, since it was ordained for slaves, used to instruct the soul by means of externals and bodily objects, drawing it as though by chains of obedience to the commands, so that man might learn to agree with God.' (57) We miss here the Pauline

54. adv. haer. III xx 1; H. ii 105f. In a real sense the Fall of man does not mean that God must devise a new plan. The intention of God is still the same, and Irenaeus does not consider the hypothetical question of whether the plan God actually used differed from his original plan. Irenaeus's concern is strictly with the salvation of man as he is.
55. adv. haer. IV xiv 2; H. ii 185.
56. adv. haer. IV xvi 3; H. ii 191; cf. the whole section IV xiv 3 - xvii 4; H. ii 185 - 97; cf. IV xx 8; H. ii 219.
57. adv. haer. IV xiii 2; H. ii 181f. 'to agree with God' - the Latin reads: 'servire Deo'; the Armenian (followed here) presupposes 'assentire Deo'.

contrast between Law and Grace, but this does not mean that Irenaeus is unaware of any difference between the Old Testament and the New; it is simply that he understands it in a different way.⁽⁵⁸⁾ Certainly, however, his insistence on the continuity of the Old and New Testaments in his polemic against the Gnostics and his insistence on the preparation for the New Testament in his concept of salvation history greatly reduce the sharp contrast between the two seen by Paul.

It is, of course, for Irenaeus, the same Word who was active in creation and revelation who comes to man to bring about his salvation.⁽⁵⁹⁾ The Word comes to his own;⁽⁶⁰⁾ and indeed 'from the beginning the Word of God has been accustomed to ascend and descend for the sake of the salvation of those who were in distress.'⁽⁶¹⁾ Furthermore the identity of the creative Word with the redeeming Word can also be illustrated from the names that he bears:

And he has a double name in the Hebrew tongue, Messiah, Christ (Anointed), and (in Armenian) Jesus, Saviour, and both names are names of certain deeds

58. See above, pp. 592f.

59. adv. haer. III xi 1; H. ii 41; IV ix 1; H. ii 169; IV xi 1; H. ii 174; IV xxxiv 4; H. ii 272; V xii 6; H. ii 354; etc.

60. adv. haer. III xix 3; H. ii 105; V i 1; H. ii 315; V ii 1; H. ii 317.

61. adv. haer. IV xii 4; H. ii 179; cf. Dem. 46. The subject of 'assuesco' in Irenaeus has been well discussed by P. Éviéux, 'Théologie de l'accoutumance chez saint Irénée', in RSR 55(1967), pp. 5 - 54.

performed. For he is named Christ (Anointed), because through him the Father anointed and arrayed all things, and according to his coming as man, because he was the Anointed by the Spirit of God his Father, . . . and Saviour from the fact that he became the cause of salvation to those who were at that time freed by him from all manner of ills and from death, and those to be, who believed after them, and the conferrer of eternal salvation. (62)

So in the names, Jesus and Christ, Irenaeus sees indications of both his creative and redeeming work.

62. Dem. 53; cf. Ev. Ph. para. 19; 47. Three points in the text require comment: (1) '(in Armenian)' Smith deletes this, and adds (Anointed) after Christ to convey the sense of the Greek.

(2) 'deeds performed'.

The association of names with 'Works' depends on the fact that a name can be given only by one who is prior in time to the one on whom the name is bestowed. (cf. ApocryJn II 3.15 - 17; = BG 24.4 - 6; Justin Martyr, II Ap. 6(44DE); Ev. Ver. 39.3 - 6, 28 - 40.2.) Hence, 'Jesus' and 'Christ' are not strictly names at all (since that would imply that the Son was not co-eternal with the Father) but appellations derived from something that is done. Irenaeus is at this point dependent on Justin Martyr (II Ap. 6(44Dff.)), but, as Houssiau observes, Irenaeus has somewhat confused the line of the argument by adding a reference to Christ's being anointed with the Spirit in his Incarnation; Justin simply referred the name 'Christ' to the divinity and the name 'Jesus' to the humanity. See Houssiau, op. cit., p. 182f. and J.A. Robinson, op. cit., pp. 14 - 19.

(3) 'and Saviour'. Cf. adv. haer. IV xvii 6; H. ii 200, where some such idea as this seems necessary for the understanding of the text,

In the context of God's redemptive purposes, we must examine here two passages which suggest that God was in some way obliged to save man. In the first of these, (63) Irenaeus argues that for God to have left man in the power of Satan would have been an admission of failure on God's part; therefore, at least in part, the salvation of man is a demonstration of God's absolute sovereignty. The second passage is more difficult:

For since the saving one pre-existed, it was right too for what was to be saved to come into existence, so that the saving one should not be without purpose (cum enim prae-exsisteret salvans, oportebat et quod salvaretur fieri, uti non vacuum sit salvans). (64)

While the passage clearly emphasises the pre-existence, the references to salvation may easily lead us into a misunderstanding of the passage, as though it were implying that man had to disobey God in order that Christ should live up to his title effectively. This is to interpret 'salvation' solely in the sense of redemption from the disaster that man brought on himself by his disobedience to God. This leads to the unacceptable conclusion that God ordained man's Fall so that Christ could justly be called Saviour. But 'salvation' has a

62. (contd.) namely, that the name 'Jesus' demonstrates an affinity of the Son to the Father, probably on the basis of the link between 'Jesus' and יהוה ישועה (cf. Mt. 1.21). See Harvey ii 200, note 3.

63. adv. haer. III xxiii 1; H. ii 125.

64. adv. haer. III xxii 3; H. ii 123.

wider significance for Irenaeus, and the point at issue in the context is that the 'animal' man (Rom. 5.14) is to be saved by the 'spiritual' man. Since the 'spiritual' man pre-exists, there must be, logically, an 'animal' man also. The passage fits, therefore, into the theme of the total divine economy for man rather than into the more restricted theme of man's disobedience. Irenaeus's concern is with the fact that it is the gift of the Spirit that makes possible the salvation of the whole man.

Turning to what was achieved by Christ through his Incarnation, we find that the three themes of man's development, man's defeat by Satan and man's disobedience in Adam are taken up again. In brief, the true lines of man's growth are seen in Christ, Satan is himself defeated by Christ, and man's disobedience is undone by the obedience of Christ.

It is a matter of vital theological importance to Irenaeus that in the Incarnation the Word of God takes flesh that is the same as that which man has through his likeness to Adam. Here the activity of God on man's behalf in salvation history reaches its climax. Unless it is the same flesh of man that was led astray and disobeyed God that is now made whole through Christ, there can be no valid talk of Redemption. Redemption means the saving of that which was lost, and since man is made up of flesh, soul and spirit, all three being required for the perfect man,⁽⁶⁵⁾ redemption necessarily includes the redemption of the flesh, which is an essential part of man.

65. See above, pp. 623f.

This leads ultimately, as we shall see, ⁽⁶⁶⁾ to an insistence on the resurrection of the flesh as a necessary corollary of redemption. In the first place, however, the seriousness with which Irenaeus takes the flesh leads him to emphasise that in the Incarnation the Word of God exhibits an essential likeness to man descended from Adam who had himself been created 'in the image and likeness of God'.

The true purpose of Irenaeus's insistence on Christ's likeness to man in his Incarnation is soteriological; unless it is the original creation that is saved there is no real redemption:

But if the Lord had borne flesh from some other substance, then that which through transgression had become hostile would not yet have been reconciled to God. ⁽⁶⁷⁾

Therefore God does not make a new creation, but redeems the old, ⁽⁶⁸⁾ and in his birth Christ preserves the likeness to Adam, 'for if he did not receive the substance of flesh from man, he became neither man nor the Son of man; and if he did not become what we were, he did nothing great in what he suffered and endured.' ⁽⁶⁹⁾ Much of this, of course, is set in the context of anti-Gnostic polemic. The Gnostic idea of salvation meant an escape from the world, not the salvation of the world. This Irenaeus vehemently opposes and insists that the Saviour, when he comes, comes to save

66. See below, pp. 673 - 77.

67. adv. haer. V xiv 3; H. ii 362.

68. adv. haer. III xxi 10; H. ii 121.

69. adv. haer. III xxii 1; H. ii 121.

the whole man, and is therefore incarnate in the literal sense of the word, and furthermore this means that the flesh of Christ is the same flesh that all men share by their descent from Adam, for it was Adam's sin and condition that made salvation necessary. The polemic against the Gnostics is therefore strengthened by the concept of salvation history in which redemption is linked to creation. Christ comes in the likeness of sinful flesh in order, as man, to save man, 'for it was right that he who undertook to destroy sin and redeem man worthy of death should become what he was, this is, man; who indeed had been drawn into bondage by sin, and was held by death, so that sin might be put to death by man, and man might go forth from death.⁽⁷⁰⁾ Christ, therefore came 'in the likeness of sinful flesh, that he might condemn sin and cast it out of the flesh as a condemned thing.'⁽⁷¹⁾ The flesh of Christ and the flesh of man are of the same substance. The only difference is that man's flesh is sinful flesh, Christ's flesh is sinless, and 'the righteous flesh has reconciled the flesh that was bound in sin and has led it into friendship with God.'⁽⁷²⁾

Most important of all, however, is the fact that Christ's Incarnation in the same flesh as Adam makes possible the exhibition of the true image and likeness

70. adv. haer. III xviii 7; H. ii 101.

71. adv. haer. III xx 2; H. ii 107; cf. IV ii 7; H. ii 150; V xxi 1; H. ii 381.

72. adv. haer. V xiv 2; H. ii 362.

after which man was first made, and hence the restoration of man in the image and likeness of God. Christ is, therefore, the image in which man was once made and the image for the new creation of man, which is none other than the original creation brought to perfection.⁽⁷³⁾ Consequently, the Incarnation is itself part of the redemptive act and not simply the precondition for redemption to take place:

So the Lord, summing up afresh this man, reproduced the scheme of his incarnation, being born of a virgin by the Will and Wisdom of God, that he too might copy the incarnation of Adam, and man might be made, as was written in the beginning, 'according to the image and likeness' of God.⁽⁷⁴⁾

This goes well beyond the demands of polemic and the rejection of the Gnostic conception of redemption, and replaces it with a coherent plan of salvation that links up intimately the need of redemption and the redemptive action. The image of God and man after the image of God provide Irenaeus with a secure link between Adam and Christ. Commenting on 'for as the image of God hath he made man' (Gen. 9.6), Irenaeus says: 'and the "image" is the Son of God, in whose image man was made. And therefore, he was "manifested in the last times" (I Pet. 1.20), to show the image like unto himself.'⁽⁷⁵⁾

73. Cf. 'Er stellte ihnen (sc. den Gegnern) den gottmenschlischen Logos als die causa exemplaris unserer irdischen Leiblichkeit vor Augen und liess ihn als die causa finalis auch das Zielbild sein, auf das der Mensch hin geschaffen worden war' (Joppich, op. cit., p. 89).

74. Dem. 32.

The fact that Christ is the image after which man is made means that Christ is both like man and therefore able to be of real redemptive significance for the man of the original creation, and at the same time superior to man and is therefore able to win a victory where Adam had been defeated. Christ is greater than defeated Adam, but still man. In connection with the fact that it requires a stronger than man to save man, Irenaeus attacks the Ebionites on the ground that only God can save man: 'But who else is greater and more excellent than that man who was made after the likeness of God except the Son of God, in whose likeness man was made? And therefore at the end he himself showed the likeness, the Son of God become man, taking up into himself his old handiwork (*antiquam plasmatationem in semetipsum suscipiens*).'(76) The Word of God incarnate is therefore the meeting place of God and man. The Word of God as the image of God is truly God and at the same time the perfect exemplar of man. This does not mean that when man becomes perfect he becomes identical with God; man is never other than 'after the image', but it does mean, that in his perfection man will be a perfect copy of the image of God himself.

The manifestation of the true image of man makes possible the restoration of man after the image and likeness of God, which man lost in Adam. The way in which man

75. Dem. 22; cf. adv. haer. V xvi 2; H. ii 368.

76. adv. haer. IV xxxiii 4; H. ii 259f.

appropriates the image and likeness that have now been manifested is through the Spirit, bestowed on Christ at his baptism and poured out by him on men. This links the whole theme of the manifestation of the image and likeness to the theme of man's growth, for it is through the Spirit that man reaches his perfection.⁽⁷⁷⁾ There is, then, this very close link between the restoration of the image and likeness and the gift of the Spirit. Irenaeus's comments on a passage from the book of Baruch,⁽⁷⁸⁾ make the connection quite clear. In the passage from Baruch it is said that God found out ways by knowledge and gave it to Jacob and Israel, and afterwards appeared on earth and conversed with men. Irenaeus continues: 'But "Jacob" and "Israel" he calls the Son of God, who received from the Father dominion over our life, and having received it, brought it down to us, to those who are far from him, when "he was seen on earth and conversed with men", joining and uniting the Spirit of God the Father with what God had fashioned, so that man became according to the image and likeness of God.'⁽⁷⁹⁾ Here the 'dominion over our life' is apparently identified with the Spirit which Christ makes available to man. The link between the gift of the Spirit and the restoration of the likeness is undeniable. This is not to say that the

77. See above, pp. 623ff., below, pp. 675ff.

78. Baruch 3.29 - 37. Irenaeus ascribes the passage to Jeremiah, as he does also in adv. haer. V xxxv 1; H. ii 424.

79. Dem. 97.

'likeness' is the gift of the Spirit; ⁽⁸⁰⁾ Rather, as Irenaeus explicitly states: '(homo) similitudinem assumens per Spiritum.' ⁽⁸¹⁾

As well as this clear connection between the idea of man's growth and the manifestation of the image and likeness by Christ, the manifestation is also a restoration of what had been lost in Adam, and this is described as being in the image and likeness of God. ⁽⁸²⁾ The question then arises of the relationship between the original condition of man 'in the image and likeness of God' and the restored condition of man 'in the image and likeness of God'. The 'likeness' that man lost was immortality and incorruption, ⁽⁸³⁾ and the possibility of regaining these has been restored through the gift of the Spirit. The restoration is not, therefore, a return to a previous state, but the restoration of a previous intention - that man should grow to perfection. The plan of God for man that had been broken by man's disobedience was now once again a possibility for man, and indeed the whole of salvation history had been moving towards just this end.

80. Cf. 'la ressemblance consiste dans le don surajouté de l'Esprit' (A. d'Alès, art. cit., in RER 14(1924), p. 514). On the gift of the Spirit as the completion of man's humanity, not as an 'extra' see Wingren, op. cit., p. 158.

81. adv. haer. V vi 1; H. ii 333f. See also Joppich, op. cit., pp. 122f.

82. adv. haer. III xviii 1; H. ii 95; cf. V ii 1; H. ii 317; V xii 4; H. ii 353.

83. adv. haer. IV xxxviii 3; H. ii 296.

The restoration of the image and likeness in individual men does not automatically follow the Incarnation, but for man as a whole the disaster that occurred in Adam has now been undone. From now on, man in Christ can grow towards his true perfection. Christ, having revealed man's true likeness in his own person, calls man to follow that likeness.⁽⁸⁴⁾ In this way, men 'receiving the Word of God as a graft (by which Irenaeus means the engrafting of the Spirit⁽⁸⁵⁾) will come to the original nature of man, that which is made after the image and likeness of God.'⁽⁸⁶⁾ It is to be noted that Irenaeus does not say that man was restored to his original state but to his original nature (*natura*). Redemption is not a matter of return but of restored possibility in the course of salvation history. There is therefore no actual conflict in the theology of Irenaeus between the idea of man's development and the fact that in the redemption of man there is an idea of restoration. What is restored is not a previous state, but a previous relationship between man and God, a relationship in which man can grow aright.⁽⁸⁷⁾

84. adv. haer. III xx 2; H. ii 107.

85. See below, pp. 675ff.

86. adv. haer. V x 1; H. ii 346.

87. Cf. 'Vollkommenheit ist zunächst einfachhin das Prädikat Gottes und seines Wortes. Eine rein historische Entwicklung des Menschengeschlechtes zu dieser Vollkommenheit kommt überhaupt nicht in Betracht. Nur von Christus her, nur von der im Glauben erfassten Inkarnationsbotschaft her kann überhaupt diese Teilnahme an der göttlichen Vollkommenheit als Ziel des Menschengeschlechtes gesehen werden. Ohne die Fleischwerdung des

The second theme, concerning Satan's hold over man, is taken up again in the redemption as the defeat of Satan and the setting free of man. On occasion, Irenaeus makes use of the Biblical account of the defeat of Amalek by Moses to demonstrate the defeat of Satan by Christ. Christ 'by the stretching out of his hands was destroying Amalek and was bringing man to life from the serpent's wound through faith in him.'⁽⁸⁸⁾ The work of Christ puts into effect the judgement of God on the serpent in Eden. More important, though, to Irenaeus, is the fact that the defeat of Satan is carried out under the same conditions under which Satan originally defeated man. Adam when tempted by Satan had yielded and disobeyed God; Christ in his temptations continued to obey God and Satan was therefore defeated, and moreover, legitimately defeated.⁽⁸⁹⁾ This once again underlines the soteriological importance that Irenaeus attaches to the real humanity of Christ; in Christ man triumphs where before he had been defeated, and

87. (contd.) Wortes gäbe es keine Entwicklung in dem Sinne wie Irenäus sie meint' (Bengsch, op. cit., p. 124).

88. adv. haer. IV xxiv 1; H. ii 232; cf. IV xxxiii 1; H. ii 256; Dem. 46. Here Irenaeus is drawing on two Old Testament motifs taken from Ex. 17.10f.: Moses, by stretching out his hand (a gesture that occurs often when Moses or Aaron is the agent of a divine act - Ex. 7.19; 8.5, 16; 14.21; 7.5; etc.), assisted the Israelites to defeat the Amalekites. In Irenaeus the stretching out of Moses's hand is seen as a sign of the cross, and Amalek is a type of Satan, man's enemy.

89. 'Et tertio itaque vincens eum, in reliquum repulit a semetipso quasi legitime victum' - adv. haer. V xxi 2; H. ii 383.

so the fallen creation is redeemed:

because death ruled in the body, it was necessarily through the body that it should be done away with and let man go free from its oppression. So 'the Word was made flesh,' in order that sin, destroyed by means of that same flesh through which it had gained the mastery and taken hold and lorded it, should no longer be in us; and therefore our Lord took up the same first formation for an Incarnation, that so he might join battle on behalf of his forefathers, and overcome through Adam what had stricken us through Adam.⁽⁹⁰⁾

Christ has won his victory fairly over his enemy and man goes free.⁽⁹¹⁾

Two things in fact follow from the defeat of Satan: man is set free; and the power of death is broken. Satan had persuaded man to disobey the command of God and so had gained power over man. Once Satan is defeated man goes free, 'for the binding of that one becomes the setting free of man.'⁽⁹²⁾ Likewise, since death came upon man through his disobedience, the defeat of Satan robs death of its power.⁽⁹³⁾ This breaking of the power of death is carefully

90. Dem. 31; Cf. adv. haer. V xxi 1; H. ii 381; Dem. 37f.

91. Part of the merit of God's victory lies, for Irenaeus, in the fact that 'non cum vi, . . . sed secundum suadelam, quemadmodum decebat Deum suadentem et non vim inferentem accipere quae vellet' - adv. haer. V i 1; H. ii 315; cf. IV xxxvii 1; H. ii 285; IV xxxvii 3; H. ii 288; Dem. 55; Ep. ad Diog. 7.4f.

92. adv. haer. V xxi 3; H. ii 384.

93. adv. haer. III xxiii 7; H. ii 129; cf. Dem. 38 - The Word 'sanctified our birth and abolished death, loosing those same bonds by which we were held.'

set by Irenaeus in the context of the whole saving work of Christ, his Incarnation and the redemption of man:

So, if he was not born, neither did he die; and if he did not die, neither was he raised from the dead; and if he was not raised from the dead, he has not conquered death, nor is its reign abolished; and if death is not conquered, how are we to mount on high⁽⁹⁴⁾ into life, being subject from the beginning to death?

The disobedience of man, the third theme of man's condition after the Fall, finds its complement in the obedience of Christ. Indeed it is in terms of disobedience and obedience that Irenaeus works out the concept of redemption rather than in terms of sin and the forgiveness of sins. This theme is worked out at some length in a number of passages where Adam and Christ are compared and contrasted. Christ comes in the likeness of Adam's flesh. More important, perhaps, the disobedience of Adam which led to the bondage of all men in sin is undone by the obedience of Christ:

And because, being all implicated in the first formation of Adam, we were bound to death through disobedience, the bonds of death had necessarily to be loosed through the obedience of him who was made man for us.⁽⁹⁵⁾

The contrast appears with considerable frequency both in the adversus haereses and the Demonstratio.⁽⁹⁶⁾

94. Dem. 39.

95. Dem. 31.

96. adv. haer. III xviii 7; H. ii 101; III xxi 10; H. ii 120; III xxii 4; H. ii 124; V xxi 1; H. ii 381; Dem. 31. See also below on Recapitulation, pp. 684 - 92.

If we ask what the obedience of Christ involves, the answer is the Passion. It is in obedience to God that Christ undergoes the cross and death. Obedience, therefore, is not mere moral up-rightness but the willingness to undergo whatever was necessary for man's salvation. Irenaeus sees this, in the first place, in the parallels between the disobedience of Adam in respect of a tree and obedience of Christ in respect of another tree:

And the sin that was wrought through the tree was undone by the obedience of the tree, obedience to God whereby the Son of man was nailed to the tree, destroying the knowledge of evil, and bringing in and conferring the knowledge of good; and evil is disobedience to God, as obedience to God is good . . . So by obedience, whereby he obeyed unto death, hanging on the tree, he undid the old disobedience wrought in the tree.⁽⁹⁷⁾

This however, does not in fact make clear the place of death in the scheme of redemption; it links it very strongly to the beginnings of salvation history, but that is not enough. The answer lies in the close connection Irenaeus sees between sin and death.⁽⁹⁸⁾ The death of Jesus is in fact, quite apart from the theme of

97. Dem. 34; cf. adv. haer. V xvi 2; H. ii 368f.; V xvii 4; H. ii 371f. The first half of the above passage (down to the omission) is included by Froidevaux and Ter Mekerttschian (PO XII/5) as part of Dem. 33. The remaining editors divide as above.

98. See above, pp. 631ff. Cf. adv. haer. IV xxii 1; H. ii 228.

disobedience and obedience in salvation history, of crucial significance for man's salvation: Christ must really undergo death to free man from death. The hope of man's salvation lies in the fact that Christ has triumphed over death by rising from the dead; but to rise from the dead, you must first really die; you cannot simply escape death. In Christ's resurrection from the dead lies man's hope: 'He himself having become the beginning of the living, since Adam became the beginning of the dying.' (99) The salvation of man depends therefore not only on the Incarnation but on the resurrection from the dead, and hence on the death of Christ in obedience, 'for his sufferings are our ascension on high.' (100)

Christ is 'the first-born of the dead'. (101) In the same chapter of the Demonstratio from which that phrase comes, Irenaeus links Jesus as the first-born of the dead with two other 'firsts' and thereby forms another link between the death of Christ and salvation history beside the link of disobedience and obedience. Christ is 'the first-born, first-begotten of the thought of the Father, the Word, himself in the world making all things perfect by his guidance and legislation.' In that we have a summary of the activity of the Word in creation and

99. adv. haer. III xxii 4; H. ii 124.

100. Dem. 45. On the importance of Christ's death for Irenaeus see Wingren (op. cit., pp. 113 - 43).

101. Dem. 39.

revelation. Christ is also 'the first-born of the Virgin, . . . freeing those who follow him from hell.' The reference to the Incarnation marks the turning point of salvation history; and then he is also 'the first-born of the dead, head and source also of the life unto God',⁽¹⁰²⁾ thereby pointing men towards their final goal and the end of salvation history. 'Thus, then, does the Word of God "in all things hold the primacy".'⁽¹⁰³⁾

Even though his opposition to the Gnostics did not govern the way Irenaeus interpreted the death of Jesus, his opposition did determine his insistence on the reality of Jesus' passion and death. In most of the Gnostic systems there are references to the passion of Sophia, which ultimately brought about the formation of this world by the Demiurge. This 'passion' is a disturbance in the harmony of the divine Pleroma, and is the start of all the trouble.⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ In their exegesis of the New Testament the Gnostics would understand statements about the passion of Christ as references to the passion of Sophia.⁽¹⁰⁵⁾ Against this notion Irenaeus writes with scorn: There is no comparison between this passion which leads to disaster and the passion of Christ which leads to salvation.⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ Irenaeus attacks

102. *ibid.*

103. *Dem.* 40

104. Once again we are not concerned here with the accuracy of Irenaeus's views. For a discussion of the passion of Sophia in the *Apocryphon of John* and in Valentinianism see above, pp. 336f., 373 - 85.

105. *adv. haer.* I iii 3; H. i 27; I viii 2; H. i 71.

106. *adv. haer.* II xx 3; H. i 323.

the Gnostics again on their interpretation of the death of Jesus. Since in the Gnostic view redemption is salvation from the world and not of the world, the heavenly Christ, the Saviour, does not belong to this world and cannot undergo death.⁽¹⁰⁷⁾ For Irenaeus, however, the real death of Jesus is fundamental to the whole pattern of salvation. True salvation requires real resurrection which itself requires a real death. Consequently Irenaeus can say: 'for if he did not truly suffer, no thanks to him, since there was no suffering at all.'⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ Furthermore, Christ led us astray in urging us to take up our cross if he did not endure his own.⁽¹⁰⁹⁾ Chapters 68 to 85 of the Demonstratio, too, are devoted to a collection of texts from the Old Testament, all of which are there to show that the Messiah was to undergo suffering and death and to rise again, and that Jesus in his passion, death and resurrection accurately fulfilled the expectations of the prophets.

Before leaving the third theme of Adam's disobedience and Christ's obedience there is one further aspect that needs to be considered. The theme of disobedience and

107. Again, for a discussion of the Valentinian attitude to the death of Jesus, see pp. 458 - 80.

108. adv. haer. III xviii 6; H. ii 99.

109. adv. haer. III xviii 5; H. ii 98; cf. also the fragment of a lost work of Irenaeus published by Ch. Mercier, 'St. Irénée et son correspondant, le diacre Démètre de Vienne', in RHE 38(1942), pp. 143 - 51; printed also in B. Reynders, Vocabulaire de la Démonstration, p. 75.

obedience is taken up again with reference to Eve and Mary as well as to Adam and Christ. The theme occurs three times, twice in the adversus haereses, (110) and once in the Demonstratio, which clearly expresses the comparison:

And just as it was through a virgin who disobeyed that man was stricken and fell and died, so too it was through the Virgin, who obeyed the Word of God, that man resuscitated by life received life. (111) . . . for Adam had necessarily to be restored in Christ, that mortality be absorbed in immortality, and Eve in Mary, that a virgin, become the advocate of a virgin, should undo and destroy virginal disobedience by virginal obedience. (112)

The interest of Irenaeus lies in the parallelism of the two cases, and this produces an ellipse in the train of thought. Strictly speaking it is not Mary's obedience that gives man life; Mary's obedience makes possible the work of Christ in obedience to the will of the Father, and that gives man life and frees him. There is a qualitative difference between Mary's obedience and Christ's: Mary's is not to the death of the cross and the subsequent life-giving resurrection. The Incarnation is not in itself redemption though it makes

110. adv. haer. III xxii 4; H. ii 123f.; V xix 1; H. ii 375f.

111. Smith comments (op. cit., p. 169): 'The difficulty, however, in the interpretation of this sentence is to determine the identity of "(the) man resuscitated": the human race, or Christ? The statement is applicable to either, but it seems to me that the reference is to the human race, although to be sure represented in the concrete by Christ.'

112. Dem. 33; cf. Justin Martyr, Dial. 100(327CD), see above, p. 254.

redemption possible, and Mary's obedience is the first stage in that process, and Mary's obedience does, by 'recircumlatio' unravel the knot which Eve had tied by her initial disobedience. (113)

Man Redeemed:

As a result of the redemptive work of Christ the situation into which man fell through the seduction of Satan and his own disobedience has been radically altered. A new dispensation has been inaugurated with the coming of Christ, and the acceptable year of the Lord has been ushered in, 'that is, all the time from his coming to the consummation, in which he (so the Lord) gathers in those who are being saved like fruits.' (114) Salvation history continues, therefore, beyond the resurrection to the consummation as a period of harvest. We shall return to this in the next section. Here we must discuss the change brought about in man by the redemptive act.

Primarily, man redeemed means man in a new or rather renewed relationship with God. This is variously expressed as a union between God and man, communion with Christ, and adoption as sons of God. So 'the Word of God . . . was made man among men . . . in order to abolish death and bring to light life, and bring about the communion of God

113. adv. haer. III xxii 4; H. ii 123f.

114. adv. haer. II xxii 2; H. i 327

and man.' (115) Or, as in another passage: 'So he united man with God and brought about a communion of God and man.' (116) Irenaeus establishes this union of God and man on the basis of the Incarnation. By being both God and man Christ is able to unite the two:

For it was necessary for the mediator of God and men, through his own affinity with both, to lead both into friendship and harmony (ἔδει γὰρ τὸν μεσίτην Θεοῦ τε καὶ ἀνθρώπων, διὰ τῆς ἰδίας πρὸς ἑκατέρους οἰκειότητος, εἰς φιλίαν καὶ ὁμόνοιαν τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους συναγαγεῖν); and on the one hand to present man to God, and on the other to make God known to men (καὶ Θεῷ μὲν παραστήσαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἀνθρώποις δὲ γνωρίσαι τὸν Θεόν). (117)

115. Dem. 6.

116. Dem. 31; cf. adv. haer. III xviii 7; H. ii 100; IV xiii 1; H. ii 181; V i 1; H. ii 315; V i 3; H. ii 316; Dem. 40. The Seal of Faith which was found shortly after the Demonstratio (published by H. Jordan in TU 36/3 (1913), as Fragment 6) quotes from Dem. 31, but distorts it by an easy corruption in a monophysite sense to read: 'Then also he brought about one nature of God and man' (See Smith, op. cit., pp. 165f.).

117. adv. haer. III xviii 7; H. ii 100f. Greek preserved by Theodoret, Dial. II. In the last phrase the Latin differs markedly from the Greek: 'et facere ut et Deus assumeret hominem et homo se dederet Deo.' Harvey (ii 101, note 1), following Grabe, considers that the Latin translator used a mutilated text. Sagnard follows the Latin. No significant theological controversy hangs on the difference and we have followed the Greek as being a somewhat stronger expression than the Latin.

Here it must be noted carefully that union between God and man is not the same as the union of the divinity and humanity in one person in Christ. The union between God and man that Christ re-establishes is akin to the relationship between two individuals in marriage. The Incarnation is essential for the establishment of this union, but it is not itself the union of men with God. (118)

118. This has been clearly shown by Houssiau, who concludes: 'Le Christ est Médiateur parce qu'il s'est fait chair. Non par une sorte de médiation physique - comme si l'union de l'homme et de Dieu se réalisait physiquement dans l'incarnation - car la médiation est une réalité morale: elle rétablit l'amitié entre le Père et nous' (op. cit., pp. 203 - 15, quotation from p. 214). Joppich argues differently and concludes: 'So sind also wir alle im Fleische Christi mit Gott vereint worden' (op. cit., p. 106; cf. also E. Scharl, Recapitulatio Mundi. Der Rekapitulationsbegriff des heiligen Irenäus und sein Anwendung auf die Körperwelt (Freiburg i. B., 1941; = Freiburger theologische Studien 60), pp. 47ff.). Joppich appears not to realise that as well as words meaning 'union' to describe the relationship between God and man established by the Incarnation, Irenaeus also uses words such as 'amicitia', thus establishing the nature of the union as a relationship (e.g. adv. haer. III xviii 7; H. ii 100f.: $\beta\lambda\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\iota\alpha$; amicitia et concordia). In fairness to Joppich, he avoids the suggestion that man is automatically united to God in the Incarnation by distinguishing between the 'Erlöser-Sein-' and the 'Erlöser-Tun Christi' (op. cit., pp. 108f.); Nevertheless, even in these terms, the union of man to God belongs to the latter not the former. The same distinction we have made between the essential union of God and man in Christ and the union of God and man

God had been bringing about this communion through the old covenant, 'accustoming man to bear his Spirit and to have communion with God,' (119) and in Abraham 'man was accustomed to follow God's Word.' (120) Finally, Christ re-establishes the communion of God and man that had been lost in Adam, 'in order to link up the end with the beginning (*ἵνα τὸ τέλος συνάψῃ τῇ ἀρχῇ*), that is, man to God.' The prophets, moreover, had foretold the coming of the Word in flesh, 'through which the mingling and communion (*commixtio et communio*) of God and man was made in accordance with the Father's will.' (121) In all this we can discern the movement of salvation history as God prepares for and then carries out his plan, a plan that brings the end into line with the initial intention of God.

Although the union of the divine and the human in the incarnate Christ provides the possibility of the unity of God and redeemed mankind, the gathering in one is nevertheless a work that Christ accomplishes: He gathers the

118. (contd.) through Christ reduces considerably the tension that Joppich uses as the starting-point for his whole discussion in his section 13 - the distinction between the present union of man with God in Christ and the coming union, a tension which Joppich resolves by reference to the concept of growth and the work of the Holy Spirit (op. cit., pp. 114ff.).
119. adv. haer. IV xiv 2; H. ii 185.
120. adv. haer. IV v 4; H. ii 157.
121. adv. haer. IV xx 4; H. ii 215f. Greek preserved in the Florilegium Achridense (in ZNTW 53(1962), p. 254).

Church; ⁽¹²²⁾ He 'graciously poured himself out in order to gather us into the Father's bosom.' ⁽¹²³⁾ The new relationship is by no means automatic on the basis of the Incarnation. The Word of God is 'true man and "wonderful counsellor and God the mighty" (Is. 9.6), calling man back again into communion with God, that by communion with him we may have part in incorruptibility.' ⁽¹²⁴⁾ Men are called to this fellowship which has its counterpart in a new fellowship among men as well. ⁽¹²⁵⁾ In this new fellowship and union with God, the Spirit plays a significant part. Christ received the Spirit to bestow it, and in Christ the Spirit has been united with the creation to make man in the image and likeness of God. ⁽¹²⁶⁾ This new relationship is also expressed as communion with Christ as well as union with God, and this is a moral communion as the following makes clear:

And again, not in any other way were we able to learn, except by seeing our teacher, and understanding his voice through our hearing, so that having become imitators of his deeds and doers of his words, we might have communion with him. ⁽¹²⁷⁾

Elsewhere again the new relationship of man to God is spoken

122. adv. haer. III vi 1; H. ii 22; cf. III v 3; H. ii 20.

123. adv. haer. V ii 1; H. ii 317f.

124. Dem. 40.

125. Dem. 72.

126. Dem. 97; cf. adv. haer. V i 1; H. ii 315.

127. adv. haer. V i 1; H. ii 314; cf. V xiv 2; H. ii 361.

of in terms of knowledge.⁽¹²⁸⁾ In all this it is abundantly clear that salvation history cannot be regarded as over: man still has a long way to go.

The most important category for the description of the new relationship of God to man is that of sonship: Through the redeeming work of Christ, men may now become sons of God by adoption. In the following passage there is a clear link between the Incarnation, redemption and adoption, indeed redemption is seen in terms of adoption: The Son of God became Son of man 'in order that we might receive adoption through him, man bearing and comprehending and embracing the Son of God.'⁽¹²⁹⁾ Just as redemption is closely associated with immortality,⁽¹³⁰⁾ so the adoption can be in a sense equated with the possession of incorruption and immortality.⁽¹³¹⁾ The necessity of the Incarnation for the giving of this adoption is the same as for the winning of the victory for man: Adoption can be given to man only by one who is himself man, and therefore we cannot receive the adoption of sons unless the Word made flesh has bestowed it on us.⁽¹³²⁾ The work which Christ accomplished, then, is the adoption of men; it is the reason for the Incarnation and its reception includes immortality and a close union with Christ.⁽¹³³⁾ In

128. adv. haer. III x 3; H. ii 35f.; cf. V xii 4; H. ii 353.

129. adv. haer. III xvi 3; H. ii 84.

130. See below, pp. 672ff.

131. adv. haer. III xix 1; H. ii 103.

132. adv. haer. III xviii 7; H. ii 101.

133. adv. haer. III xviii 7; H. ii 103; III xx 2; H. ii 107; IV xi 1; H. ii 174; IV xvi 5; H. ii 192; IV

addition, the Church, as the seed of Abraham, has received adoption through Christ and will inherit the promises of God to Abraham,⁽¹³⁴⁾ and the Spirit through the apostles has proclaimed the coming of the time of adoption,⁽¹³⁵⁾ and the adoption itself is linked to the out-pouring of the Spirit;⁽¹³⁶⁾ the Spirit prepares men to become sons of God,⁽¹³⁷⁾ and possession of the Spirit is a foretaste of what will be hereafter.⁽¹³⁸⁾ So once again it is clear that there is still a goal to be reached, towards which man is moving; salvation history remains to be completed.

The end-goal of adoption and the final destiny of man is described on occasion in terms of deification. This requires closer examination.⁽¹³⁹⁾ The concept occurs in two main passages. In both of these Irenaeus is dealing with the correct use of the name 'God'. Against the Gnostic

133. (contd.) xxxvi 2; H. ii 277.

134. adv. haer. IV viii 1; H. ii 165; V xxxii 2; H. ii 414;
- a theme common in the Apologists.

135. adv. haer. III xxi 4; H. ii 115.

136. adv. haer. V xii 2; H. ii 351; V xviii 2; H. ii 373f.

137. adv. haer. IV xx 5; H. ii 216.

138. adv. haer. V viii 1; H. ii 339.

139. See especially, L. Baur, 'Untersuchungen über die Vergöttlichungslehre', in TQ 101(1920), pp. 28 - 64, 155 - 86.

idea of an ultimate divine being beyond the creator of the world, Irenaeus points out that the Scriptures acknowledge none other as God but 'the Father of all and the Son and those who have the adoption.'⁽¹⁴⁰⁾ This exalted state of those who receive adoption seems to spring from two factors: one is the close-knit nature of the community that exists between God and redeemed man; the other is that Irenaeus is attempting to interpret two texts from the Psalms in terms of his insistence on there being only one God when the text clearly speaks of 'gods' in the plural.⁽¹⁴¹⁾ In the light of his insistence also that all Scripture is intelligible and meaningful,⁽¹⁴²⁾ Irenaeus has recourse to identifying the plural 'gods' as the community of the faithful. This does not mean, however, that Irenaeus has obscured the distinction between man and God, or that he regards man as essentially divine in the same way that God is, even when man reaches his perfection.

In the lengthy section in which Irenaeus answers the

140. adv. haer. IV pf. 4; H. ii 146; cf., with almost identical wording, III vi 1; H. ii 20f.; IV i 1; H. ii 146.
141. Both texts are from the same Psalm: 'God stands in the congregation of the gods, he judges among the gods'; and 'I have said, You are gods, and all of you sons of the Most High' (Ps. 82.1 and 6).
142. Cf. 'cum itaque universae scripturae, et prophetiae et evangelia, in aperto et sine ambiguitate et similiter ab omnibus audiri possint' (adv. haer. II xxvii 2; H. i 348); and 'nihil enim vacuum, neque sine signo est apud eum (sc. Deum)' (adv. haer. IV xxi 3; H. ii 228).

hypothetical question: Could not God have made man perfect at the outset, he asserts that man must grow, 'since we were not made gods from the beginning, but at first men, then finally gods.'⁽¹⁴³⁾ A little later Irenaeus states: 'for it was right that you should at first maintain the rank of a man, and then afterwards share in God's glory; for you do not make God, but God makes you.'⁽¹⁴⁴⁾ This quotation administers a necessary caution about the 'deification' of man. Man is to participate in the divine glory, but this does not remove the distinction between the creator and his creatures;⁽¹⁴⁵⁾ to call man a god does not make him identical with God. Irenaeus's further exegetical comments on the Psalm mentioned above are also important in this regard. The verse of the Psalm reads: 'I have said, You are gods; and all of you sons of the Most High.' As we have seen, Irenaeus takes the term 'god' strictly in some passages, but, discussing the same verse of the Psalm in another context, Irenaeus concludes his argument by referring to man as being made eventually 'after the image and likeness of God'.⁽¹⁴⁶⁾ And in yet another passage the same verse is understood with reference to receiving the adoption of sons and sharing in God's immortality.⁽¹⁴⁷⁾ This, then, is what it

143. adv. haer. IV xxxviii 4; H. ii 297.

144. adv. haer. IV xxxix 2; H. ii 298f.

145. Cf. adv. haer. II xxxiv 2; H. i 382; III xx 2; H. ii 106; IV xi 2; H. ii 175.

146. adv. haer. IV xxxviii 4; H. ii 297.

147. adv. haer. III xix 1; H. ii 102f.

means to be god: to share in the eternal life of God. (148)

Irenaeus's real concern is for the close relationship that is now possible between God and man redeemed through Christ. Christ has enabled man to become a son of God by adoption through faith in Christ and doing his will. (149)

There is a close link between the redemption brought by Christ and the gradual creation of man 'in the image and likeness of God'. In creation, the image was not clear, and through the Fall the 'likeness' was lost, but in the

148. Paul Gächter ('Unsere Einheit mit Christus nach dem hl. Irenäus', in ZkathTh 58(1934), pp. 503 - 32) makes clear the fact that the union of man with God is neither a question of man simply becoming essentially God, nor, at the same time, is it merely a moral union. Gächter speaks of the union as 'weder eine Verschmelzung noch eine substantielle, hypostatische Verbindung mit dem Vater, . . . sondern nur eine unio personalis (oder hypostatica: defined in a footnote as "personhaft") accidentalis deren Möglichkeit bzw. Denkbarkeit durch die ungleich stärkere Verbindung der Inkarnation ja nahegelegt wird' (p. 509). A little later he writes: 'diese communio bezeichnet bei Irenäus im allgemeinen jenes dynamische Verhältnis, kraft dessen der Mensch der göttlichen Güter teilhaftig wird, seines Lebens, seiner Herrlichkeit, besonders seiner Unvergänglichkeit und Unsterblichkeit' (p. 510).

149. adv. haer. III vi 2; H. ii 22; III x 2; H. ii 34; III xix 1; H. ii 103; IV xxi 3; H. ii 227; IV xli 2f.; H. ii 304ff.

Incarnation Christ established both.⁽¹⁵⁰⁾ From now on man may grow to his ultimate state in the perfection of both the image and the likeness through the work of God himself. Through his likeness to the Son man becomes precious to the Father.⁽¹⁵¹⁾ Irenaeus takes up the Pauline distinction between man's original likeness to Adam and his likeness to Christ through redemption, and further defines this as belief in the name of the Lord and reception of his Spirit.⁽¹⁵²⁾ In this likeness man has incorruption,⁽¹⁵³⁾ and not only man the individual, but the Church as a whole, grows into that likeness to Christ.⁽¹⁵⁴⁾ The whole emphasis here is on the fact that the redemptive act of Christ was not the end of salvation history; the act was definitive, but its appropriation continues right up to the consummation. There is, therefore, nothing automatic about man's salvation, just as there is nothing automatic about man's growth. The saving work of Christ does not mean that all men will be saved, only that all men can now be saved, but the salvation must be appropriated. On the other hand, man's growth and development is not simply an evolutionary process; he would not become perfect in his own good time, as though the process begun at the creation ran straight on through history

150. adv. haer. V xvi 2; H. ii 368.

151. adv. haer. V xvi 2; H. ii 367.

152. adv. haer. V xi 2; H.ii 348f.; cf. V ix 2; H. ii 343.

153. adv. haer. V i 1; H. ii 314.

154. adv. haer. IV xxxvii 7; H. ii 291.

to the consummation without interruption. For both his salvation and his real development and growth man is totally dependent on the gracious act of God in the Incarnation and the redemption that that made possible.⁽¹⁵⁵⁾ So it is God who perfects man, not man who perfects himself. The work of perfecting is variously attributed to the Spirit,⁽¹⁵⁶⁾ the Word,⁽¹⁵⁷⁾ the Lord,⁽¹⁵⁸⁾ and the hand of God.⁽¹⁵⁹⁾ God's ultimate purpose is that man should be in his image and likeness,⁽¹⁶⁰⁾ and this is made possible by the Incarnation in which 'at the end, the Word of the Father and the Spirit of God, united with the ancient substance of Adam's formation, brought about the living and perfect man, receiving the perfect Father, so that, just as on the animal level (in animali) we were all dead, so on the spiritual level (in spiritali) we shall all be made alive' (I Cor. 15.22).⁽¹⁶¹⁾ Very fittingly the adversus haereses ends on the same note.⁽¹⁶²⁾

There are several other expressions which Irenaeus

- 155. This is concisely expressed by Bengsch in the passage quoted above, n. 87.
- 156. adv. haer. III xvii 3; H. ii 93; V vi 1; H. ii 334; V viii 1; H. ii 339.
- 157. adv. haer. V xvi 2; H. ii 368.
- 158. adv. haer. V xxi 2; H. ii 381.
- 159. adv. haer. V xvi 1; H. ii 367.
- 160. adv. haer. IV xxxviii 3f.; H. ii 296f.
- 161. adv. haer. V i 3; H. ii 317.
- 162. adv. haer. V xxxvi 2; H. ii 429.

uses as well as 'after the image and likeness of God', which have a similar significance, all of them serving to emphasise the closeness of the union that exists between God and man, or rather, that now exists because of the redemptive work of Christ. Most important among these are those that speak of man's ultimate destiny as 'seeing' God,⁽¹⁶³⁾ and even as 'receiving' God.⁽¹⁶⁴⁾

When we outlined Irenaeus's understanding of redemption as the defeat of Satan, we indicated two corollaries of that defeat: man was set free; and death was robbed of its power. We must now examine these corollaries a little more closely. Irenaeus speaks of man's liberty in two ways. In the first place it is freedom from the power of Satan and the bondage in which he held man. Consequently the defeat of Satan ensures the freedom of man.⁽¹⁶⁵⁾ On several occasions Irenaeus uses the word 'freedom' to describe the entire work of Christ and his achievement for man. So Irenaeus speaks of the work of Christ as the restoration of liberty;⁽¹⁶⁶⁾ the gospel is 'the new covenant of liberty';⁽¹⁶⁷⁾ Irenaeus likens the work of Christ to the freeing of slaves by a

163. adv. haer. IV xx 7; H. ii 219.

164. δέχομαι, and χαρίζω and cognates: e.g. adv. haer. III xx 2; H. ii 107; IV xxxvii 7; H. ii 291; V i 3; H. ii 317; IV xxviii 2; H. ii 245; etc.

165. 'Victus autem erat Adam, ablata ab eo omni vita; et propter hoc victo rursus inimico recepit vitam Adam' - adv. haer. III xxiii 7; H. ii 129.

166. adv. haer. III v 3; H. ii 20; cf. IV xx 4; H. ii 216.

167. adv. haer. III xii 14; H. ii 70f.; cf. III x5; H. ii 38; IV xvi 5; H. ii 192; IV xxxiii 14; H. ii 268; IV xxxiv 3; H. ii 271.

king; (168) he quotes with approval John 8.36 ('If the Son makes you free, you will be free indeed'); (169) and the Incarnation takes place 'when the fullness of the time of liberty came'. (170) Thus, the freeing of man is also set in the time-scale of salvation history.

The other way in which Irenaeus uses the word 'freedom' is as freedom from the Law. Irenaeus discusses the purpose of the Law at some length in Book IV of the adversus haereses. (171) Both the Law and the Gospel come from one and the same God, as Irenaeus insists in his polemic against the Gnostics. (172) More than polemic governs the thought of Irenaeus however, and the Law has its place in salvation history. The Law was part of the saving work of God and was intended to lead men to Christ, for it 'taught men beforehand to follow Christ.' (173) Irenaeus was well aware both of Paul's moral dilemma and of the danger of legalism. (174) It was from mere servile obedience to the letter of the Law that Christ came to set men free; the Word set the soul free, 'which done, it was necessary for the chains of slavery to be taken away, to which man had

168. adv. haer. IV xi 1, 3, 4; H. ii 174ff.; IV xxxiv 1; H. ii 270.

169. adv. haer. III xix 1; H. ii 102.

170. adv. haer. IV xxii 1; H. ii 228.

171. esp. adv. haer. IV viii ff.; H. ii 165ff.

172. adv. haer. IV xii 3; H. ii 178.

173. adv. haer. IV xii 5; H. ii 179; cf. IV ii 7; H. ii 150; IV xiii 2; H. ii 181.

174. adv. haer. III xx 3; H. ii 108; IV viii 1ff.; H. ii 165 - 68.

now become accustomed, and to follow God without chains. (175)

It was God's intention that man should serve him not as a slave but as free, and the Law, having served its preparatory purpose in salvation history was annulled.

Through their rejection of Christ the Jews remain in the bondage of the Law. (176) Irenaeus is careful to point out that freedom from the Law does not mean licence; Christ does not in fact abolish the Law, he fulfils it by replacing the Law, which he himself had given originally, with his own presence. (177) Having received life, 'we should no more

175. adv. haer. IV xiii 2; H. ii 181f.

176. adv. haer. IV xxxiii 1; H. ii 256.

177. adv. haer. IV xvi 4; H. ii 192. Bengsch examines in some detail the relationship between the freedom of the gospel and the idea of man's education. Over against the Gnostic idea of the education of the spiritual seed and the soul through being enclosed in matter (see above, pp. 419 - 28 esp. pp. 427f.), Irenaeus places the idea of education through salvation history. But salvation history is only a reality where man is free to choose, and for Irenaeus salvation history leads to a higher freedom found only as a result of the Incarnation: not the freedom to respond to the call as in Gnosticism (salvation without history), nor mere education to a greater depth (history without salvation), but freedom to obey, seen in the obedience of Christ in suffering on the cross to show the love of God, the culmination of God's action in history; to a like obedience the disciples are called through taking up their cross. Thus through the Incarnation man has been educated to a higher freedom: Man's freedom and man's development are not mutually exclusive. See Bengsch, op. cit., pp. 136 - 41.

turn back, I mean, to the former legislation. For we have received the Lord of the Law, the Son of God; and through faith in him we learn to love God with our whole heart, and our neighbour as ourselves.' (178)

The work of Christ, and above all the resurrection of Christ have further implications for man beyond sonship and freedom, implications that are important for the final goal of man in salvation history. Through the work of Christ man receives immortality. So important is this in Irenaeus's understanding that on occasion immortality is seen as not so much the result of Christ's redemptive work as the very purpose of the Incarnation. (179) The reason is not hard to find. The gift of life and immortality is closely linked by Irenaeus with the condition of man. When Adam fell he lost life, and death was brought on him. (180) Had man not disobeyed God 'he would always remain as he was, that is, immortal.' (181) Consequently the redemption of man includes the restoration of man to life and immortality. (182) The gift of life, like communion with God and adoption as sons, is not automatic; it comes through man's conformity to Christ, (183) and is closely associated with the vision of God: 'but vision of God is creative of incorruptibility; and incorruptibility brings proximity to God.' (184) Immortality,

178. Dem. 95.

179. adv. haer. III xix 1; H. ii 103; Dem. 31; 37; 40.

180. See above, pp. 630ff.

181. Dem. 15.

182. Dem. 33.

183. adv. haer. V i 1; H. ii 314.

184. ὁρασις δὲ θεοῦ περιποιητικὴ ἀφθαρσίας. ἀφθαρσία δὲ ἐγγύς

therefore, is part of the final goal of man towards which he continues to move. Life is an inheritance that man gains through Christ, a gift of God for which he can only be thankful. (185)

The resurrection of Christ is the guarantee of the gift of life to man. Christ was incarnate, and descended even under the earth, seeking the lost sheep, and having found it, raised it and offered it to the Father, 'making in himself the first-fruits of the resurrection of man; so that just as the head rose from the dead, so also the rest of the body of every man who is found in life should arise when the time of his condemnation for disobedience had been completed.' (186) Irenaeus takes the idea of the resurrection quite literally; resurrection means the raising of the flesh:

(The Word of God was made flesh), that he might manifest the resurrection of the flesh (or, body), and take the lead of all in heaven. (187)

Quite apart from the uncertainty caused by the fact that Armenian uses one word to express both *σῶμα* and *σάρξ*, (188)

184. (contd.) εἶναι ποιεῖ θεοῦ: adv. haer. IV xxxviii 3; H. ii 296. Greek preserved by John of Damascus, Sacra Parallela.

185. adv. haer. III xx 2; H. ii 106; V i 3; H. ii 316.

186. adv. haer. III xix 3; H. ii 105.

187. Dem. 39.

188. See, e.g. Robinson, op. cit, note on ch. 38.

there is little emphasis on the resurrection of the flesh in the Demonstratio.⁽¹⁸⁹⁾ However, the teaching receives considerable emphasis in the adversus haereses; but there are good reasons why this should be so. Two major points of Irenaeus's attack on Gnosticism were that this world is the creation of the one God who is active in creation and redemption alike, and that it is not 'the man within' who escapes from the matter in which he is imprisoned and is so saved, but it is the whole of man who is the object of God's saving activity.⁽¹⁹⁰⁾ From the first point it follows that the material world, of which the flesh of man is part, is subject to the saving activity of God; and from the second point it follows that man is saved body and all.

While much of what Irenaeus says about the salvation of the flesh is set in the context of anti-Gnostic polemic, the idea of the salvation of the flesh is in fact fundamental to Irenaeus's own theology. This can be clearly seen from the way in which Irenaeus holds a consistent attitude to the flesh in all that he says about it; it is as a fleshly creature that man is made in the image of God,⁽¹⁹¹⁾ and in the Incarnation Irenaeus insists that the Word of God takes on the same flesh that all men share from Adam and bestows life on it, and it is this same flesh that is saved in the

189. Dem. 31; 38; 39; 86, and even then in no detail.

190. On the Valentinian attitude to the flesh and to resurrection see above, pp. 506ff.

191. See above, pp. 620ff.

end. The flesh is closely integrated into the whole divine plan for man; it is part of salvation history. (192)

It is, for Irenaeus, a sign of God's power that he can raise the flesh to incorruption; indeed if he does not do so he is lacking in power. (193) To those who would say that the flesh cannot become immortal, Irenaeus would say: If God can make man out of nothing originally, then he can certainly reintegrate the flesh of man and give it life when he will; and furthermore, if the flesh can genuinely be considered living now, then God certainly has the power to infuse life again into his own creation and restore dead men to life. (194) Consequently, 'they are altogether deluded who despise God's entire organization (*qui universam dispositionem Dei contemnunt*), and deny the salvation of the flesh, saying that it is not capable of incorruption.' (195) The resurrection of the flesh is connected with both the Incarnation and the resurrection of Christ, for again, why did the Word of God become flesh if the flesh was not to be saved, (196) and if there were no resurrection of the flesh, Christ would not have risen after three days. (197) The flesh, then, as part of the creation of God is a worthy object for salvation.

Irenaeus also maintains that salvation must be for the

192. See especially Joppich, *op. cit.*, pp. 80 - 90.

193. adv. haer. V iii 2; H. ii 325f.; cf. V xii 6; H. ii 354; V xxxi 1; H. ii 411.

194. adv. haer. V iii 3; H. ii 327f.; cf. *Frag.* XXXIV; H. ii 498.

195. adv. haer. V ii 2; H. ii 318; cf. IV pf. 4; H. ii 146.

196. adv. haer. V xiv 1; H. ii 360.

197. adv. haer. V xxxi 1; H. ii 411.

whole man. The perfect man consists of the union of body, soul and spirit,⁽¹⁹⁸⁾ and Irenaeus argues that anything short of the salvation of the whole man, flesh and all, would be blasphemy.⁽¹⁹⁹⁾ It is along these same lines that Irenaeus interprets a passage of St. Paul that at first sight appeared to contradict this: 'that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God' (I Cor. 15.50).⁽²⁰⁰⁾ Irenaeus accused the heretics of misunderstanding this text in their attempt to prove that the creation as such is not saved.⁽²⁰¹⁾ Against this Irenaeus argues hotly. The gist of his argument is that flesh and blood do not constitute the whole man and cannot of themselves inherit the kingdom of God; what is needed is the life-giving Spirit which will translate the flesh and blood into the kingdom of God.⁽²⁰²⁾ What Paul was really saying is this: 'Make no mistake;

198. adv. haer. V vi 1; H. ii 333 - 35; see above, pp. 623ff.

199. *Templum igitur Dei, in quo spiritus inhabitat Patris, et membra Christi non participare salutem, sed in perditionem redigere dicere, quo modo non maximae est blasphemiae?* - adv. haer. V vi 2; H. ii 336.

200. referred to frequently in the passage adv. haer. V ix 1 - x 2; H. ii 341ff.

201. adv. haer. V ix 1; H. ii 341; cf. V xiii 2; H. ii 356; I vi 1; H. i 51. Despite the fact that Irenaeus himself misinterprets Paul, he is closer in spirit to Paul than the Gnostics are. See Joppich, *op. cit.*, pp. 31 - 38. On the differences between Irenaeus and Paul see E. Aleith Paulusverständnis in der alten Kirche (Berlin, 1937; = Beiheft 18 ZNTW), who considers that the basic reason for the differences is the different concept of man.

202. adv. haer. V ix 1 - 4; H. ii 341 - 45; cf. Dem. 42. The order is to be noted; Irenaeus insists that it is

since unless the Word of God dwells in you and the Spirit of the Father is in you, and if you live idly and haphazardly, as though this were all, being (merely) flesh and blood, you will not be able to inherit the kingdom of God.' (203) The argument is continued in what follows, and further light is shed on the relation of the Spirit to the flesh and blood. The gift of the Spirit to man is akin to the grafting in of a wild olive; no change takes place in the actual wood, but the quality of the fruit is much improved; 'so too, man, having been grafted in by faith and receiving the Spirit of God, certainly does not lose the substance of flesh, but changes the quality of the fruit of his works and receives another name, indicating his change for the better, now being not (mere) flesh and blood, but being and being called a spiritual man. (204)

Not only is the redemption by Christ effective for the whole man, it is effective for all men as well, including Adam and all those who have died already. Here we see yet again the way in which the whole plan of redemption is wedded to the scheme of salvation history. The redemption takes up again and again the themes of man's first beginning. That Adam himself should be saved

202. (contd.) the Spirit that takes possession of the mortal flesh and thereby gives it life, and not the flesh which gains possession of the Spirit. See Joppich, op. cit., pp. 119 - 22.

203. adv. haer. V ix 1; H. ii 345; cf. V xiii 2ff.; H. ii 356ff.

204. adv. haer. V x 2; H. ii 346.

is, in Irenaeus's opinion, only logical and just. It seems to Irenaeus quite irrational to suggest that whereas Adam was defeated by Satan, only Adam's descendants are freed by Satan's defeat.⁽²⁰⁵⁾ Irenaeus even goes so far as to say that if Adam, the lost sheep, is not saved, then no-one at all is saved.⁽²⁰⁶⁾ Christ descends to Hades to bring the good news to the departed,⁽²⁰⁷⁾ and all those who hoped in him, that is, those who proclaimed his coming, who served his arrangements, the righteous, the prophets and the patriarchs, believed in him.⁽²⁰⁸⁾ Nothing whatsoever,

205. adv. haer. III xxiii 2; H. ii 125; Irenaeus's lengthy defence of Adam's salvation (III xxiii 1 - 8; H. ii 124 - 30) is directed in particular at Tatian who denied this doctrine (III xxiii 8; H. ii 130). On the theme of the descent of Christ to Hades for the salvation of Adam in the literature before Irenaeus see above, pp. 103, 132, 183 and 256.

206. adv. haer. III xxiii 7; H. ii 129f.; cf. Dem. 33.

207. Dem. 78. Irenaeus here comments on a verse which he assigns to Jeremiah: 'And the Lord the Holy One of Israel bethought him of his dead, which in the past had slept in the dust of the earth, and went down unto them to bring the good news of salvation to deliver them.' The text is not scriptural, but was assigned to Jeremiah by Justin Martyr (Dial. 72 (298B), see above, pp. 256f.). Irenaeus is clearly dependent on Justin, but the frequency with which he cites the text indicates that he shared Justin's opinion regarding the descent of Christ to Hades: adv. haer. III xx 4; H. ii 108f. (assigned to Isaiah); IV xxii 1; H. ii 228 (assigned to Jeremiah); IV xxxi 1; H. ii 256 (anonymous); IV xxxiii 12; H. ii 267 (assigned to 'alii'); V xxxi 1; H. ii 411 (assigned to 'the prophet').

208. adv. haer. IV xxvii 2; H. ii 241; cf. III xxii 4; H. ii 124.

therefore, is left out of the scope of Christ's saving work; all the threads of the Old Testament, of the preparation for salvation, are taken up in the salvation itself. As a final indication of this we may observe that Irenaeus maintains that Christ passed through every phase of man's life in order to sanctify it, leading to the somewhat startling conclusion that Jesus was about fifty years old when he was crucified. (209)

Recapitulation:

Having outlined Irenaeus's understanding of the redemption achieved by Christ, we have still to consider one aspect of it, which we have left to the end. As will become apparent from the following discussion, the doctrine of the recapitulation does not involve a different view of redemption, but it does serve to bring together certain aspects of redemption, particularly with relation to the whole plan of salvation history. It offers a very clear expression of the way in which the act of redemption is linked to all the preparation that went before, and especially to the initial act of creation. In addition, recapitulation is important in a Christological study, for the subject of the recapitulating is, in the majority of cases, Christ himself.

The verb 'recapitulo (ἀνακεφαλαιόω)' and the noun 'recapitulatio (ἀνακεφαλαιώσις)' occur 52 times in the

Demonstratio. Of these, three occurrences represent the simple meaning 'to summarise' or 'a summary' and do not concern us here.⁽²¹⁰⁾ We shall consider the remaining occurrences in a number of sub-sections, dividing them by subject and, under each subject, by the object of the recapitulation.

In by far the greatest number of cases it is Christ who recapitulates, and it is these cases that are most important for Christology. On thirteen occasions it is said that Christ recapitulates everything (omnia, universa, τὰ πάντα). All of these occurrences employ the verb and are dependent to a greater or less degree on Ephesians 1.10.⁽²¹¹⁾ The meaning of the passage in Ephesians is clear: the divine mystery, that is the purpose of God previously hidden, has now been made known; which is, God's intention to gather up or unite all things in heaven and on earth in Christ. This mystery has now been revealed, but the actual gathering up itself is viewed eschatologically, though a foretaste is granted in the gift of the Spirit (Eph. 1.11, 13). The clear pattern that lies behind this is that, as all things began in harmony, so harmony and unity will eventually be re-established by God in Christ, though at the moment the

210. John sums up in Jn 1.14 what he has to say about the Word (adv. haer. I ix 2; H. i 83); Moses sums up the Law (IV ii 1; H. ii 147); and Isaiah sums up his prophecy (V xxxiii 4; H. ii 419).

211. εἰς οἰκονομίαν τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν, ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

harmony is broken. So the verb 'ἀνακεφαλαιῶ' takes up the compounds of the word itself: κεφάλαιον, a summary or sum total, and ἀνά, 'up' in the sense of 'back, up', or repetition. God will re-establish in Christ the unity of all things. (212)

Already we can notice one major difference between Ephesians and Irenaeus: it is no longer God who recapitulates in Christ, but Christ who recapitulates. Hand in hand with this major shift in emphasis go a number of other differences that will become clear as we proceed. Of the thirteen occasions in Irenaeus in which it is said that Christ recapitulates everything, six simply state that the purpose of the Incarnation was the recapitulation of everything. (213) It is not at all clear in these cases just how far the ideas of Ephesians have been carried over into the writings of

212. See further, e.g., J.B. Lightfoot, Notes on Epistles of St. Paul, (London, 1904), pp. 321 - 23; B.F. Westcott, Saint Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians (London, 1906), ad loc.; J.A. Robinson, St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, 2nd ed. (London, 1909), ad loc.; E.F. Scott, The Epistles of Paul to the Colossians, to Philemon and to the Ephesians (London, 1930; = Moffatt NT Commentary), ad loc.

213. adv. haer. III xi 8; H. ii 50 (The Greek text makes no reference to recapitulation); V xviii 3; H. ii 375 (the passion and death are included with the Incarnation); I iii 4; H. i 29 (Eph. 1.10 is used by the Gnostics to demonstrate that the Saviour was the product of all the Pleroma); I x 1; H. i 91; Dem. 6; 30.

Irenaeus, but one thing is clear, the emphasis has shifted: recapitulation is now not so much a goal of which we have a foretaste, as something already accomplished, at least in part, in the Incarnation, even if the final goal is still to be reached. Two further passages in which Christ is said to recapitulate all things will be discussed below since the 'all' is further qualified by some other object. (214)

The remaining five instances in which Christ is said to recapitulate all things shed some further light on the shift of emphasis towards the work of Christ in the Incarnation itself. Irenaeus insists, for example, that there is one God the Father, 'and one Christ Jesus our Lord, who comes in every arrangement (*veniens per universam dispositionem*), and gathers up everything in himself.' (215) The eschatological element is by no means absent here, but a few sentences further on we read this:

(And the Word became man), recapitulating everything in himself (*universa in semetipsum recapitulans*), so that just as the Word of God is supreme (*princeps*) in super-celestial, spiritual and invisible things, so too he may have the supremacy (*principatum*) in visible and corporeal things, taking to himself the primacy (*primatum*) and appointing himself head of the Church (*et apponens semetipsum caput ecclesiae*), (and) may draw everything to himself at the appropriate time (*universa attrahat ad semetipsum apto in tempore*).

Here we at once notice that Irenaeus has interpreted recapitulation as though the word ἀνακεφαλαιώ were derived

214. adv. haer. III xxi 9; H. ii 119; V xxi 1; H. ii 380.

215. adv. haer. III xvi 6; H. ii 87.

from a compound of ἀνά and κεφαλή. Recapitulation has now to do with Christ as the head of the Church. We notice again the point mentioned above, that the recapitulation is now closely associated with the Incarnation as the essential context of its implementation, even though the continuing work of Christ in drawing everything to himself still goes on 'at the appropriate time'. For Irenaeus the recapitulation has been effected in the Incarnation and is still being effected as Christ draws all things to himself.

Similar points to those just made can be made in respect of another passage, in which Irenaeus quotes Ephesians 1.10 with particular reference to Christ's uniting things spiritual and earthly. He continues:

These things therefore he recapitulated in himself (haec igitur in semetipsum recapitulatus est), uniting man to the Spirit and establishing the Spirit in man, having himself become head of the Spirit (ipse caput Spiritus factus) and bestowing the Spirit to be the head of man (hominis caput), for through it we see and hear and speak. (216)

Again we notice the etymology that is assumed, but especially the location of the act of recapitulation in the Incarnation by which the Spirit and God's created handiwork are united. (217) In both this passage and the previous one we see also that Christ's work of recapitulation has a clear reference to certain things and circumstances obtaining prior to the Incarnation that

216. adv. haer. V xx 2; H. ii 380.

217. See above, esp. pp. 612 - 15.

Christ recapitulates in himself. This is also the case in the last of the occasions in which Christ is said to recapitulate all things: God did not make man perfect at first because man could not have borne it, 'and therefore, too, our Lord, at the end of times, recapitulating all things in himself (ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν καιρῶν, ἀνακεφαλαιώσας εἰς ἑαυτὸν τὰ πάντα), came to us not as he could have done, but as we were able to behold him.' (218) There appears to be here an undefined but nevertheless unmistakable connection between man's development and Christ's recapitulation.

Considerably greater clarity and precision are brought to the concept when we turn to the second set of objects that Christ is said to recapitulate. On eleven occasions Christ is said to recapitulate man or Adam and on nine further occasions, creation. We shall consider these together, for as the texts will make plain, in the idea of creation, the thought uppermost in Irenaeus's mind is of man as the creature of God. Of the texts to be considered, one is simply a statement of the fact that Christ recapitulates man, (219) and one leads to yet another object of recapitulation which will be considered below. (220) The remaining passages may be divided somewhat artificially into those that help to define the content of recapitulation and those that help to define the purpose of recapitulation.

218. adv. haer. IV xxxviii 1; H. ii 292f. Greek preserved by John of Damascus, Sacra Parallela.

219. adv. haer. III xvi 6; H. ii 87.

220. adv. haer. V xxiii 2; H. ii 387.

The common thought of the first of these two groups⁽²²¹⁾ is that there is no true recapitulation unless Christ, through his birth from the Virgin Mary, shares in the likeness of Adam's birth and generation.⁽²²²⁾ The thought is most extensively expounded in the long passage from Book III of the adversus haereses.⁽²²³⁾ Irenaeus begins by demonstrating that Jesus is not the son of Joseph 'but according to the promise of God, from David's belly the eternal king is raised up, who recapitulates all things in himself.'⁽²²⁴⁾ Immediately, Irenaeus's thought shifts from the 'all' to the particular: 'and he recapitulated in himself the old formation.'⁽²²⁵⁾ The train of thought is then as follows: As sin came through the disobedience of

221. adv. haer. III xxi 9 - xxii 3; H. ii 119 - 23; IV vi 2; H. ii 159 (Immediately before this passage Irenaeus quotes from the work adversus Marcionem of Justin Martyr. The reference to recapitulation may well stem from the work of Justin, but Justin himself did not develop the concept in the way in which Irenaeus has); V i 2; H. ii 316; V xiv 2; H. ii 361f.
222. The parallelism between Adam and Christ is referred also to Eve and Mary, though the term used is 'recircumlatio' (adv. haer. III xxii 4; H. ii 123f. and see above, p.656).
223. III xxi 9 - xxii 3; H. ii 119 - 23.
224. Sed secundum repromissionem Dei de ventre David suscitatur Rex aeternus, qui recapitulatur omnia in se (adv. haer. III xxi 9; H. ii 119).
225. Et antiquam plasmationem in se recapitulatus est (ibid., H. ii 120).

one man, and death through sin, so life too came through one man; and as Adam had been created by the hand of God from the virgin earth, 'so the existing Word, recapitulating Adam in himself, rightly received the generation for the recapitulation of Adam from Mary who was as yet virgin. (226)

If Adam had been born in the normal way then the second Adam should have been the son of Joseph, but since Adam was from the earth, 'it was right that he who recapitulated in himself the man formed by God should maintain the similarity of origin with him. (227) Irenaeus does not pursue the similarity too far: the fact that Adam was made from the earth does not imply that the Word should be made incarnate by God from the earth in a new creation. The Word had to be incarnate of the same flesh as Adam, 'so that the formation might not become different, nor what was being saved different, but that very same one should be

226. ita recapitulans in se Adam ipse Verbum exsistens, ex Maria quae adhuc erat virgo, recte accipiebat generationem Adae recapitulationis (III xxi 10; H. ii 120).

227. ἴδει καὶ τὸν ἀνακεφαλαιούμενον εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ πεπλασμένον ἄνθρωπον τὴν ἐκείνῃ τῆς γεννήσεως ἔχειν ὁμοιότητα (ibid.). Greek preserved by Theodoret, Dial. I. The latin differs slightly: 'oportebat id ipsum Verbum recapitulationem Adae in semetipsum faciens,' . . . The difference is not significant.

recapitulated, preserving the similarity.' (228) Here we reach the heart of Irenaeus's argument: unless the Incarnate Word receives something from the Virgin Mary, (229) and hence shares in Adam's likeness, there can be no real salvation. Christ comes in the likeness of man: 'But that we are body taken from the earth and soul receiving the Spirit (or, breath) from God, anyone at all will acknowledge. The Word of God, therefore, became this, recapitulating his handiwork in himself.' (230) Irenaeus enlarges on the real humanity of Jesus and concludes: 'For all these things are signs of

228. ἵνα μὴ ἄλλη ἢ πλάσις γένηται, μηδὲ ἄλλο τὸ σωζόμενον ᾧ, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ἐκεῖνος ἀνακεφαλαιωθῇ, τηρουμένης τῆς ὁμοιότητος (ibid.; H. ii 121). Greek text preserved by Theodoret, Dial I. Harvery reads πλάσις; Sagnard reads ἡ πλάσις.

229. The 'conclusion inéluctable' of Sagnard (Irénée, III, p. 377) that the argument of Irenaeus points to the absence of any sin 'même "originelle"' in Mary is not at all convincing. It suggests a developed doctrine of original sin which Irenaeus does not have. The whole point of the present passage is that by his birth from the Virgin Mary Christ shows the likeness of our human nature descended from Adam.

230. Hoc itaque factum est Verbum Dei, suum plasma in semetipsum recapitulans (adv. haer. III xxii 1; H. ii 121; cf. IV vi 2; H. ii 159; V.i 2; H. ii 316; V xiv 2; H. ii 361f.). Irenaeus has here passed over to a second theme of the parallels between Adam and Christ. On the one hand Christ and Adam are alike in the virginity of their respective births; on the other hand Christ, through the Virgin Mary shares the likeness of human nature as descended from Adam.

flesh taken from the earth, which he recapitulated in himself, saving his own handiwork.'⁽²³¹⁾ Irenaeus further justifies this by saying that this accounts for Luke's tracing the genealogy of Christ back to Adam, 'indicating that he is the very one who recapitulated in himself all nations dispersed from Adam on and all languages and the generations of men including Adam himself.'⁽²³²⁾

From the preceding paragraph a much clearer picture of the meaning of recapitulation in Irenaeus is beginning to emerge. When Irenaeus talks of Christ's recapitulating Adam he means in effect the redemption of Adam through Christ's taking up the struggle which Adam once lost, doing so on the same terms as those under which Adam had lost, but this time being victorious. In short we have here again some of the precise themes we outlined in the earlier section on the redemption of man. Christ comes as man to save man. The section above is mainly given over to the fact that Christ recapitulates man, but the saving significance of the recapitulation emerges with much greater clarity in those passages where the purpose of recapitulation is expressed.

In this second sub-section of those passages in which

231. ταῦτα γὰρ πάντα σύμβολα σαρκὸς τῆς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς εἰλημμένης, ἣν εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἀνακεφαλαιώσατο, τὸ ἴδιον πλάσμα σώζων. (adv. haer. III xxii 2; h. ii 122).

Greek preserved by Theodoret, Dial. I. Harvey reads ἀπὸ γῆς; Sagnard reads ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς.

232. adv. haer. III xxii 3; H. ii 123; cf. V xxiii 2; H. ii 387.

the object of Christ's recapitulating is creation or man the saving significance of Christ's coming as man is apparent. After each statement that Christ recapitulates the creation or Adam, a purpose is stated. These may be given as follows:

(Christ recapitulates), in a brief compass providing us with salvation, so that what we lost in Adam we might receive in Christ Jesus, that is, to be after the image and likeness of God. (233)

(Christ recapitulated), so that he might destroy sin, and rob death of its power, and make man live. (234)

(Paul urges us to put on the new man which is renewed in knowledge after the image of its creator). And when he says, 'After the image of its creator', he indicates the recapitulation of that man who in the beginning was made after the image of God. (235)

(Christ recapitulated man), so that just as our race descended into death through man being defeated, so again we might ascend into life through man the victor, and just as death took the victory palm against us through a man, so again we might receive the victory palm against death through a man. (236)

(Christ recapitulated man) that he too might copy the incarnation of Adam and man might be made, as was written in the beginning, 'according to the image and likeness' of God. (237)

(Christ recapitulated man), that mortality might be absorbed in immortality. (238)

233. adv. haer. III xviii 1; H. ii 95.

234. adv. haer. III xviii 7; H. ii 102.

235. adv. haer. V xii 4; H. ii 353 - commenting on Col. 3.10.

236. adv. haer. V xxi 1; H. ii 381.

237. Dem. 32.

238. Dem. 33.

From all these it is abundantly clear that recapitulation refers to the whole way in which the plan of God for man's redemption is worked out. Recapitulation is not redemption, but the presupposed set of circumstances that makes the genuine redemption of Adam possible. In recapitulating Adam, the Word of God does not simply repeat the circumstances of Adam's coming into existence.⁽²³⁹⁾ Rather, in recapitulating man, Christ, so to speak, brings him back under his right head, which means in fact demonstrating the true image and likeness of man, and taking up again the battle that man had once lost, this time in victory. None of this is any different from the understanding of redemption outlined in the preceding sub-sections, but with the concept of recapitulation redemption receives a key idea that unifies the whole pattern.

Recapitulation as the means by which man's original battle is renewed, this time victoriously for man, is clearly seen in the next group of passages in which the object of Christ's recapitulating is the condition of man prior to redemption. So Christ is said to have recapitulated 'that enmity'⁽²⁴⁰⁾ or 'the war against our enemy.'⁽²⁴¹⁾

239. The fact that recapitulation itself is to be seen in the total scope of the plan of salvation history, seen as a plan unfolding in a straight line, precludes any idea of a simple return to the beginning. See below, P p. 694ff.

240. adv. haer. IV xl 3; H. ii 304; cf. V xxi 2; H. ii 381.

241. adv. haer. V xxi 1; H. ii 380; we adopt the punctuation of the edition in SC 153, on the basis of the Armenian; cf. also Robinson, op. cit., p. 98: Omnia ergo

In another passage Christ himself speaks of the shedding of all blood from that of Abel to that of Zacharia (Lk. 11. 50), 'indicating the future recapitulation in himself of the shedding of the blood of all the righteous and the prophets from the beginning and the requisition of their blood through himself.'⁽²⁴²⁾ Christ also recapitulates Adam's disobedience⁽²⁴³⁾ and the promise made to the fathers.⁽²⁴⁴⁾ Even the very day of Adam's defeat is recapitulated.⁽²⁴⁵⁾ The point is, not that the day was

241. (contd.) recapitulans, recapitulatus est et adversus inimicum nostrum bellum, provocans

Harvey reads: Omnia ergo recapitulans, recapitulatus est, et adversus inimicum nostrum bellum provocans .

. . . .

242. adv. haer. V xiv 1; H. ii 361.

243. adv. haer. V xix 1; H. ii 375. The disobedience of Eve is also recapitulated in Mary's obedience; see above, p. 656.

244. Dem. 37: 'In such wise, then, was his triumph of our redemption, and his fulfilment of the promise to the patriarchs, and his doing away with the primal disobedience: the Son of God became a son of David and a son of Abraham; for in the accomplishment of these things, and in their summing up in himself, in order to give us his own life, the Word of God' The precise object of recapitulation is in fact a demonstrative. In the context it could refer either to the disobedience or the promise to the fathers; Robinson, Wilson, Barthoulot and Smith leave it indefinite; Froidevaux maintains that it refers to the promises 'sans doute'. It is perhaps possible that it refers to both.

245. adv. haer. V xxiii 2; H. ii 387. The day is in fact the sixth day of the week, on which both Adam was made

repeated, but that the results of the first day were reversed. The situation of man's defeat and disobedience is once more taken in hand, this time in triumph. So radically altered is the situation that in this passage for once Irenaeus does not even say that the old creation is restored but that there is a 'second formation' (*secunda plasmatio*).

There are two further occurrences of recapitulation in which Christ is the subject. In the first⁽²⁴⁶⁾ the point is the familiar one that recapitulation is associated with seeking the lost sheep, man made in the image and likeness of the Son, but here the object of the recapitulating is not man himself, but the dispensation, God's plan. One might well say that Christ brings the plan to a head. In the other passage recapitulation is used absolutely to refer to the fact that the prophets had announced beforehand God's redemption of man.⁽²⁴⁷⁾

Only one other instance of recapitulation is of direct significance for our present study. In one passage it is said that 'God has restored again (recapitulated) in us Abraham's faith in him.'⁽²⁴⁸⁾ What is meant is not a return to a previous state, nor even the repetition of a previous

245. (contd.) and Christ died, so that it is again not so much the day as Adam who is thus recapitulated.

246. adv. haer. III xxiii 1; H. ii 124.

247. adv. haer. IV xx 8; H. ii 220.

248. Dem. 95.

condition, but the taking of a type and perfecting it. With the references towards the end of Book V of the adversus haereses to Antichrist and the Beast who are said to recapitulate all error, apostasy and deceit we are back with the common meaning of the term as summing up, here meant as summing up in a person,⁽²⁴⁹⁾ an idea also associated with the Valentinians as those who recapitulate the teaching of all the heretics.⁽²⁵⁰⁾ Nevertheless, especially in the case of the Valentinians there is some parallel with the work of Christ, for just as the Valentinians 'sum up' heresy in the sense of providing the most perfect summary of all that is wrong in Gnosticism, so Christ 'sums up' man in the sense that he provides the perfect exemplar of what man is - the perfect image after which man was made and in whom he is now remade.

From all this it is clear that, as we made clear at the beginning of this section, the doctrine of the recapitulation does not add anything new to Irenaeus's teaching on redemption; the familiar themes are all picked

249. adv. haer. V xxv 1; H. ii 391; V xxv 4; H. ii 393; V xxviii 2; H. ii 401f.; V xxix 2; H. ii 404f.; V xxx 1; H. ii 406. In connection with this, Bengsch goes so far as to speak of an 'Abfallsgeschichte' alongside the 'Heilsgeschichte'. This is going perhaps rather too far, for the conception of the summing up of evil occurs only in the context of the end of history and not throughout history. There is no persistent thread of damnation history running through history in Irenaeus as there is for example in Barnabas; see above, pp. 110ff.

250. adv. haer. IV pf. 2; H. ii 144.

up again: the manifestation of the image and likeness after which man was made; the coming of Christ in the same flesh as Adam wore; the renewal of the battle between man and Satan, this round also being between man and Satan, but with man this time victorious; the circumstances of man's fall recapitulated and the results reversed; etc. What recapitulation adds is a unifying theme that embraces in one concept the diverse strands of man's salvation.

What now can we say about the relationship of Recapitulation and of the whole act of redemption to the plan of salvation history? It is abundantly clear that recapitulation and redemption as a whole represent the realisation of God's plan. 'Realisation', however, requires some qualification, for it in no way means that the plan has come to an end and been completely worked out. All the decisive moves have now been made, but the consummation, when the final result of those moves will be seen, is still in the future.⁽²⁵¹⁾ All the major lines of salvation history pass through redemption and recapitulation and are

251. Wingren maintains that recapitulation is 'everything that Christ has done or is doing, from his birth through his passion, death, and resurrection, the Church and the Consummation, up to the time when he shall have "delivered up the kingdom to the Father" for eternity (I Cor 15.24)' (op. cit., p. 82). In the sense that Christ's work of recapitulation has significance for the continuing salvation history, this is true enough, and Irenaeus does indeed see Christ as the head of the new humanity, but the primary emphasis of Irenaeus's understanding of recapitulation is on the work of Christ in his Incarnation,

taken up, either in fulfilment or in correction. Thus, the image after which man was once made is now revealed, and in recapitulating man Christ shows the perfect image after which man was made, renews the battle man had once lost and places himself at the head of a new humanity growing towards that maturity needed for the vision of God. In recapitulation the decisive steps in the realisation of God's plan for man have been taken. The major theme of Irenaeus that provides the key to his thinking is not recapitulation but salvation history, even though recapitulation is an expressive way of conveying the putting into effect of the plan of salvation history:

He has been seen by us as a theologian of history: under the term, 'God's economy', he enfolds the entire history of the world to show that its unfolding has no other purpose than the salvation of man. He has also been seen by us as a theologian of recapitulation: the central event of this history of salvation is the Incarnation of the Son who takes up all things and leads them to their fulfilment. (252)

In the light of this, there is no idea of a return in recapitulation. Salvation history moves in one direction only. When Christ recapitulates elements of the past he does not do so to restore them to what they had once been, but, so to speak, to put them back on the rails. This is abundantly clear in the fact that in the recapitulation certain things come about which had never been the case

251. (contd.) passion and death.

252. Benoit, op. cit., p. 227.

before. Most notable among these are the manifestation of the image and likeness of God in Christ and the pouring out of the Spirit. For Irenaeus, history is not circular but linear, and the doctrine of recapitulation must be seen in that light. (253)

253. The idea of a return to the beginning is present to a greater or less degree in many of the earlier studies of the concept of recapitulation in Irenaeus. So A.d'Alès says: 'Appliqué à l'oeuvre du Christ, le mot de récapitulation désigne ce travail de reconstitution et de restauration de l'humanité selon le plan primitif de Dieu, dont le Verbe incarné est lui-même l'exemplaire parfait, . . .' ('La doctrine de la récapitulation en saint Irénée', in RSR 6(1916), pp. 185 - 211, quotation from p. 189) and again: 'La récapitulation consistera essentiellement dans la restauration de la ressemblance divine, imprimée par Dieu au front du premier homme et mise de nouveau à la portée de tous par Jésus-Christ, qui tout d'abord l'a restaurée en sa personne' (ibid., p. 196). Cf. also the studies of Bonwetsch (op. cit.), R. Potter ('St Irenaeus and "Recapitulation"', in Dominican Studies 4(1951), pp. 192 - 200), and notably E. Scharl (op. cit.). See also H.E.W. Turner, The Patristic Doctrine of Redemption. A Study of the Development of Doctrine during the First Five Centuries (London, 1952), pp. 62 - 66. All these writers make allowance for the fact that recapitulation is not merely restoration, but it is nevertheless strongly influenced in that direction, and some difficulty is experienced with Irenaeus's obvious doctrine of man's growth. The setting of the recapitulation within the wider context of the divine plan of salvation, the economy, has marked some of the more recent studies of the concept,

253. (contd.) e.g. Bengsch (op. cit.), Wingren and G.T. Armstrong. The comments of the last two are worth noting: Wingren sees recapitulation as neither repetition nor return, but rather as a perfect realizing of a potentiality previously lost; 'Man's recapitulation is renewed growth' (op. cit., p. 126). Armstrong surveys previous discussions of the concept and, after discussing the creation and the fall, concludes that recapitulation is not the restoration of the likeness to God; (sie bedeutet die Vollendung des Geschöpfes zu der Anschauung Gottes, die Adam nie erfahren hat, und die der Mensch bis zur Endzeit nicht erreicht, und insofern geht die Rekapitulation bei Irenaeus über die Wiederholung und Zusammenfassung des schon Geschehenen der Heilsgeschichte hinaus und bezieht sich auf die Fortführung der wiederaufgenommenen Entwicklung in der Kirche' (G.T. Armstrong, op. cit., pp. 63 - 79, quotation from p. 78).

VI THE CHURCH

In the previous section we have seen something of the consequences of God's action for man in Christ as Irenaeus understands it, which is that man's true nature has now been revealed and the effects of Satan's seduction and man's disobedience have been undone. The next question is: What then? Christ has triumphed and established his lordship, but what is the nature of that lordship and how are its consequences made available to men? What role do the Holy Spirit and the Church play in establishing the lordship of Christ among men? In short, what is the nature of salvation history after the great events of man's redemption?

The theme of Christ's lordship is one that merits some closer attention. It occurs quite frequently in Irenaeus and in its broadest perspective embraces the whole idea of the exalted position of Christ as the Word of God. In this connection, Irenaeus makes considerable use of Psalm 110.⁽¹⁾

1. The Psalm, and especially verse one, occurs often in the New Testament, Mt. 22.44; 26.64; Mk 12.36; 14.62; Lk. 20.42f.; 22.69; Acts 2.34f.; Rom. 8.34; I Cor. 15.25; Eph. 1.20; Col. 3.1; Heb. 1.3, 13; 8.1; 10.12f.; 12.2; and with reference to Melchizedek: Heb. 5.6, 10; 6.20; 7.3, 17, 21. In the literature before Irenaeus, 110.1 is cited by I Clement (36.5) and by Ps.-Barnabas (12.10). Justin Martyr makes extensive use of the Psalm, both the whole psalm and individual verses, and Irenaeus shares a very similar exegesis at a number of points. I Apol. 45 (82D - 83A); Dial. 32f. (250C - 251B); 56(277BC); 63 (286D); 76 (302B); 83(309A - 310A); 118(346A); 127(357D).

On the basis of this Psalm Irenaeus substantiates Christ's pre-existence, his rule over the Gentiles, his judgement of all men, his immortality, and sees in the phrase, 'He shall drink of the torrent in the way; therefore shall he lift up the head', a reference to 'the exaltation with glory after his human nature, and after humiliation and ingloriousness.'⁽²⁾ Irenaeus makes use of the same Psalm on other occasions, especially verse one ('The Lord said unto my Lord: sit on my right hand, until I make thy enemies thy footstool'), to indicate Christ's triumph over all worldly rule,⁽³⁾ his conquest of the rebellious angelic powers,⁽⁴⁾ his ascension,⁽⁵⁾ his unity with the Father,⁽⁶⁾ and his lordship over the living and the dead.⁽⁷⁾

Most frequently the rule of Christ is expressed by terms such as 'King', 'kingdom', or the corresponding verb 'to exercise kingly rule' (βασιλεύω).⁽⁸⁾ From the use of these words with reference to the rule of Christ we can obtain a fairly clear picture of what Irenaeus understood

2. Dem. 48. Irenaeus here appears to be dependent on Justin, which would account for the contrast between the present humiliation of Christ and the future glory, a contrast not usually made by Irenaeus (see above, p. 606).
3. Dem. 48.
4. Dem. 85.
5. adv. haer. III xii 2; H. ii 54 - in a quotation from Acts 2.
6. adv. haer. II xxviii 7; H. i 356; III vi 1; H. ii 21; III x 6; H. ii 39.
7. adv. haer. III xvi 4; H. ii 85.
8. e.g. adv. haer. I x 1; H. i 91; III xix 2; H. ii 104. On

by the rule of Christ. Christ's kingship fulfils the promise made to David that "of the fruit of his body" he would raise up an eternal king, whose kingdom should have no end. And this King is Christ, the Son of God, who became the Son of man.⁽⁹⁾ This same theme of Christ as the eternal king of David's line is taken up again in several places, and is in particular linked with the Virgin Birth.⁽¹⁰⁾ Irenaeus expressly declares that the kingship of Christ is not in name only;⁽¹¹⁾ He really is King, and moreover, an eternal King.⁽¹²⁾ He entered on his kingly rule at his ascension.⁽¹³⁾ Irenaeus makes ready use of those passages in the gospels in which kingship is ascribed to Jesus in his ministry: by

8. (contd.). the theme of kingship see also P. Beskow, Rex Gloriae. The Kingship of Christ in the Early Church (Uppsala, 1962), esp. pp. 90 - 97.

9. Dem. 36

10. adv. haer. III x 4; H. ii 37; III xvi 2; H. ii 83; III xxi 9; H. ii 119; Dem. 56; 66.

11. Dem. 49; cf. 95.

12. Dem. 64; cf. adv. haer. III x 2; H. ii 34.

13. Dem. 84; 88. In Dem. 84 Irenaeus makes use of Psalm 24.7: 'Lift up your gates, ye princes, and be lifted up, eternal gates: and the King of glory shall enter in.' Irenaeus uses the text with reference to Christ's passing through the firmament (see Smith, op. cit., ad. loc.). The same text is used in the Apocalypse of Peter 17, in connection with the entry to heaven as is also the case in Justin Martyr I Apol. 51(86E); Dial. 85(310Df.); 127 (357CD). In the Acts of Pilate the text is used in connection with Christ's assault on Hades (XXI). The same situation as in Dem. 84 is presupposed by Asc. Is. 11.22ff., but the Psalm is not quoted.

the Magi; ⁽¹⁴⁾ by Nathanael; ⁽¹⁵⁾ by the crowd at the triumphal entry into Jerusalem. ⁽¹⁶⁾ Even though Christ enters on his rule at the ascension, it is the resurrection that marks the triumph on which his rule is based, though Irenaeus does not distinguish rigidly between the two with regard to their significance for Christ's rule; the phrase, 'All flesh shall be humbled, and the Lord alone shall be exalted in the highest' (Is. 2.17) indicates that 'after his passion and ascension, God shall cast down under his feet all those who opposed him, and he shall be exalted over all, and there will be no-one who can be justified or compared with him.' ⁽¹⁷⁾ Christ receives power from his Father ⁽¹⁸⁾ to rule over all things; he is the King of all men promised through Isaiah and David, ⁽¹⁹⁾ and King of all the redeemed. ⁽²⁰⁾ He shall reign until all his enemies have been defeated, including death, ⁽²¹⁾ and his authority extends even over the apostate powers. ⁽²²⁾ Christ is the

14. adv. haer. III ix 2; H. ii 32; III xvi 4; H. ii 85.

15. adv. haer. III xi 6; H. ii 44.

16. Dem. 65.

17. adv. haer. IV xxxiii 13; H. ii 268.

18. adv. haer. III xii 9; H. ii 63; cf. Dem. 41.

19. Dem. 49; 52; 84; adv. haer. IV xxxiii 13; H. ii 267f.

20. Dem. 58.

21. adv. haer. V xxxvi 2; H. ii 429 - quoting I Cor. 15.25f.

22. Dem. 83; 96. In the latter we have followed the arrangement of the text adopted by Smith and Froidevaux.

Tixeront (ad loc.) and Robinson (additional note, p. 151, op. cit.) link the submission of the apostate powers to the invocation of the name of Jesus Christ spoken of at the beginning of Dem. 97.

eternal, universal King whom the Jews rejected,⁽²³⁾ and whose coming in the Incarnation brought to an end Jewish self-rule.⁽²⁴⁾ In fact, the whole work of Christ can be described as the extension of his rule or lordship:

For no other was able . . . to open the Father's book . . . , except the lamb who was slain . . . and redeemed us by his blood, receiving power over all things (*accipiens omnium potestatem*) when 'the Word became flesh', so that just as he had the primacy in the heavens as the Word of God, so also he might have the primacy on earth as a righteous man . . . and that he might have the primacy over things under the earth, he himself having become the first-born of the dead, and that all things might see . . . their King (*et ut viderent omnia . . . suum Regem*).⁽²⁵⁾

So the Word extends his rule over all things.⁽²⁶⁾

23. adv. haer. III xii 6; H. ii 59; IV xi 3; H. ii 175f.; Dem. 95.

24. Dem. 57. To Irenaeus the Jewish rejection of Christ is complete, and hence the Church is the Church of the Gentiles (adv. haer. IV xx 12; H. ii 223; V xxxiv 3; H. ii 421; Dem. 57; 95).

25. adv. haer. IV xx 2; H. ii 214.

26. As Wingren observes, Irenaeus's doctrine of the Church hinges on the fact that it is 'a manifestation of Christ's progressive dominion' (*op. cit.*, p. 141); or, 'Christ's lordship puts the Church in perspective as part of the total dominion of Christ' (*ibid.*, p. 134). Houssiau makes the point that this represents a shift in emphasis from the New Testament. There the resurrection marks Christ's entering on his rule; In Irenaeus it marks the extension of his rule (*op. cit.*, pp. 195 - 99).

The rule of Christ is expressed by Irenaeus in other ways as well. Christ is the head of the Church, ⁽²⁷⁾ the stone rejected by the builders that has become the head of the corner. ⁽²⁸⁾ To Christ as head the body is joined ⁽²⁹⁾ and follows its head in the resurrection. ⁽³⁰⁾ Commenting on a phrase from a predecessor, 'through the extension of the hands gathering the two peoples to one God', ⁽³¹⁾ Irenaeus says: 'For there were two hands because of the two peoples scattered to the ends of the earth, but one head in the middle because likewise there is one God who is over all and through all and in us all.' ⁽³²⁾ Elsewhere also we see the theme of headship arranged in a type of hierarchical structure; just as Christ is head of the Church so the Father is the head of Christ, ⁽³³⁾ and, being head of the Church, Christ is also the head of the Spirit, who is himself the head of man. ⁽³⁴⁾

27. adv. haer. III xvi 6; H. ii 88; cf. Eph. 1.22; 4.16; 5.23; Col. 1.18.

28. adv. haer. III xii 4; H. ii 57 (quoting Acts 4.11); IV xxxvi 1; H. ii 277 (quoting Mk 12.10); cf. also Ps. 118. 22; I Pet. 2.4, 7.

29. adv. haer. IV xxxii 1; H. ii 255; V xiv 4; H. ii 363 (both quoting Eph. 4.16); cf. also Eph. 1.22; 5.23; Col. 1.18.

30. adv. haer. III xix 3; H. ii 105; IV xxxiv 5; H. ii 272; Dem. 39.

31. The initial phrase, as recorded in the Greek text preserved in the Catena in IV Regum, reads $\delta\iota\alpha\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \theta\epsilon\iota\alpha\varsigma\ \epsilon\kappa\tau\delta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omega\upsilon\ \chi\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\omega}\nu$; but the $\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha\varsigma$ is to be omitted on the evidence of both the Latin and Armenian.

32. adv. haer. V xvii 4; H. ii 372; The identity of the predecessor from whom Irenaeus cites at this point is

It is one thing to assert the kingly rule of Christ and his headship over the Church, but we must also examine what evidence there is in Irenaeus for Christ's effective rule. We must, therefore, ask the question: What does Christ continue to do in salvation history? We find signs of Christ's continuing to make effective his redemptive work on the cross in the following passage:

And because he is himself the Word of God Almighty, who in his invisible form pervades us universally in the whole world, and encompasses both its length and breadth and height and depth - for by God's Word everything is disposed and administered - the Son of God was also crucified in these, imprinted in the form of a cross on the universe; for he had necessarily, in becoming visible, to bring to light the universality of his cross, in order to show openly through his visible form that activity of his: that it is he who makes bright the height, that is, what is in heaven, and holds the deep, which is in the bowels of the earth, and stretches forth and extends the length from East to West, navigating also the Northern parts and the breadth of the South, and calling in all the dispersed from all sides to the knowledge of the Father. (35)

Here there is clear evidence that Irenaeus did not consider that the Word had laid aside the work of ordering and

32. (contd.) unknown.

33. adv. haer. V xviii 2; H. ii 374.

34. adv. haer. V xx 2; H. ii 380.

35. Dem. 34.

disposing that he did in creation. God continues to uphold and sustain the universe by his Word. This is the element of creatio continua that we noted earlier.⁽³⁶⁾ However, we must also ask whether the Word continues to have a role also in the effective propagation of the redemption achieved on the cross.

We have already examined the decisive act of redemption and discussed its significance for man. What we must now do is examine the continuing salvation history between the decisive act of redemption in the resurrection of Christ and the final consummation of all things in Christ at the end of time. There are here three areas that require our attention: The role of Christ in the continuing salvation history; the role of the Church's tradition and faith in relation to the work of Christ; the role of the Spirit in relation to the work of Christ.

There is some evidence to show that Irenaeus regarded the effective propagation of the work of redemption as a continuing work of the risen Christ. A hint of this appears in the following passage in which Irenaeus asks: 'And who else is "the just man" to perfection, but the Son of God, who perfects by justifying those who believe in Him, who like him are persecuted and slain?'⁽³⁷⁾ This is not unambiguous evidence of Christ's continuing work, for although there is no doubt that Christ is the one who makes

36. See above, pp. 580ff.

37. Dem. 72.

perfect, one may still ask whether this is the direct work of Christ or the past work of Christ on the cross made effective by the Church's teaching and preaching.⁽³⁸⁾ This same point holds good in a number of other passages in which at first sight the reference is to the present work of Christ, but on close examination may refer to the work of Christ in his life, death and resurrection, the effects of which are mediated to the believer in some unspecified way. Irenaeus states that the Son of God gives us life,⁽³⁹⁾ but the context speaks of the proclamation of Christ by the prophets and of his resurrection; the 'us' may mean therefore 'us men', i.e. men in general, rather than Irenaeus and his contemporaries.⁽⁴⁰⁾ The ultimate giver of the eternal life is never in doubt, but, to use spatial terminology, is the life mediated vertically so that Christ gives life now, or is it mediated horizontally, the giving by Christ taking place once for all in the past on the cross, but the receiving taking place when men come in contact with some 'agent' of Christ?

38. The distinction made here is somewhat false, for, as we shall see, the continuing work of Christ is in fact mediated through the very structures that take their origin from the foundation of the Church. There is, however, an important question here of whether the major emphasis lies on the present lordship of Christ, albeit mediated through visible structures, or on the past work of redemption now preserved by the Church.

39. adv. haer. IV ii 4; H. ii 148 - et vitam nobis donat.

40. Cf. adv. haer. IV xxiii 2; H. ii 231 - qui aeternam vitam hominibus dat - the context is the same.

There is less occasion for ambiguity in the following two passages. In the first Irenaeus proclaims that 'since the Word of God is always one and the same, he gives to those who believe in him a spring of water unto eternal life;',⁽⁴¹⁾ and in the second he states that 'wherever anyone shall call upon him, invoking him, of those who believe in him and do his will, he comes and stands close by, accomplishing the petitions of those who invoke him with a pure heart.'⁽⁴²⁾ Because the activity of God is continuous the Son's activity can hardly be otherwise. It is on these grounds too that Irenaeus says: 'That Christ, then, being Son of God before all the world, is with the Father, both being with the Father and being with men in close and intimate communion, and king of all, for the Father has made all subject to him, and Saviour of those who believe in him - such is the message of similar passages of Scripture.'⁽⁴³⁾

It would appear then that the effective propagation of redemption is also an activity of Christ.⁽⁴⁴⁾ There is, however, one further area in which this activity of the Word is unequivocally asserted: in the Eucharist. It is

41. adv. haer. IV xxxvi 4; H. ii 279 - unus et idem cum semper sit Verbum Dei: credentibus quidem ei fontem aquae in vitam aeternam dans.

42. Dem. 97.

43. Dem. 52.

44. We have not as yet raised the question of the means by which Christ works; this is in fact the Church (see below, pp 716 - 29); See also Ochagavía, op. cit., pp. 124 - 29.

not our intention to give here a full account of Irenaeus's sacramental theology, but the importance of the continuing activity of the Word in the Eucharist, and therefore in the continuing salvation history, is unmistakable. The subject of the Eucharist is introduced into the adversus haereses in the context of the propriety of making offerings to God, and it does not appear at all in the Demonstratio. (45)

There are two main themes in Irenaeus's teaching on the Eucharist. The first of these concerns the Eucharist as an offering. The argument moves along the following lines: The offering is made not for God's sake but for man's. (46)

Man is to offer to God the first-fruits of God's creatures:

(The Lord, instructing his disciples) to offer to God the first-fruits of his creatures (*primitias Deo offerre ex suis creaturis*), not as though to one in need, but so that they themselves should not be unfruitful nor ungrateful, took bread, which is from the creation, and gave thanks, saying: 'This is my body.' Likewise he acknowledged the cup, which is from that creation to which we belong, to be his blood, and he taught the new covenant of the new oblation, (and) the Church,

45. This fact sheds some light on the purposes for which both the adversus haereses and Demonstratio were written; neither is a work of systematic theology. On the sacraments in general in Irenaeus see the relevant sections of the works cited in ch. 1 above, and of. also A. d'Alès, 'La doctrine eucharistique de saint Irénée', in RSR 13(1923), pp. 24 - 46.
46. adv. haer. IV xvii 1; H. ii 193 - the argument is repeated in the following pages.

receiving this from the apostles, in the whole world offers to God, to him who provides food for us, the first-fruits of his own gifts in the new covenant.⁽⁴⁷⁾

The Eucharist, then is the Church's offering of the first-fruits of the new covenant to God the giver of all things; it is an offering of thanksgiving. Irenaeus sums up the points so far and further defines the importance of the offering for the offerer:

Therefore, the Church's offering, which the Lord taught to be offered in the whole world, is considered as a pure sacrifice to God and acceptable to him; not that he needs sacrifice from us, but because he who offers is himself glorified in what he offers if his gift is accepted.⁽⁴⁸⁾

Irenaeus goes on to argue that 'sacrifices, therefore, do not sanctify a man, for God has no need of sacrifices; but the intention (sententia) of him who offers sanctifies the sacrifice, since the intention is pure, and compels God to accept as from a friend.'⁽⁴⁹⁾ This pure intention and offering belongs

47. adv. haer. IV xvii 5; H. ii 197ff.

48. adv. haer. IV xviii 1; H. ii 201.

49. adv. haer. IV xviii 3; H. ii 203: 'igitur non sacrificia sanctificant hominem, non enim indiget sacrificiis Deus; sed sententia (ex Arm.; Lat.: conscientia) eius qui offert sanctificat sacrificium, pura existens, et cogit (ex Arm.; Lat.: praestat) acceptare Deum quasi ab amico.' At the two points indicated the Armenian is to be preferred to the Latin; in the first case the underlying Greek was probably *γνώμη*; and in the second case the Latin probably represents an emendation of the very strong expression retained in the Armenian. See SC 100 ad loc.

only to the Church. The pure offering cannot be made by the Jews because they do not accept the Word of God, without whom no-one can know God. It cannot be made by the heretics because those who maintain that there is another Father apart from the creator (i.e. the Marcionites) would by their offering represent God as greedy for what is not his own,⁽⁵⁰⁾ and those who regard the world as the product of a defect (i.e. the Valentinians) insult their supposed Father by offering him bread and wine of this world.⁽⁵¹⁾

The mention of the heretics and their teachings leads Irenaeus to his second theme in respect of the Eucharist: Then again, how can they say that the flesh, nourished with the body of the Lord and his blood (ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ τρεφομένην), goes to corruption and has no share in life (εἰς φθορὰν χωρεῖν καὶ μὴ μετέχειν τῆς ζωῆς)?⁽⁵²⁾

Irenaeus's expansion of this in what immediately follows is of the greatest importance:

50. In fact it was for precisely this reason that Marcion argued that the love of the Father of Jesus Christ was to be remarked on. See, e.g., Tertullian, adversus Marcionem I 17,1: 'Sufficient to our god is this one single work, that he has by his great and particular kindness set man free, a kindness of more value than any number of destructive insects' (trans. by E. Evans).
51. On the Valentinian understanding of the sacraments see above, pp. 493 - 505.
52. adv. haer. IV xviii 5; H. ii 204. Greek text preserved by John of Damascus, Sacra Parallela.

For we offer to him his own, declaring consistently the fellowship and union of flesh and Spirit. For just as the bread from the earth, receiving the invocation of God (προσλαβόμενος τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τοῦ θεοῦ), is no longer common bread but Eucharist, consisting of two things, earthly and heavenly, so also our bodies, receiving the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible but have the hope of the resurrection.⁽⁵³⁾

The similarity of this teaching on the Eucharist to the whole teaching of Irenaeus on redemption will be obvious.⁽⁵⁴⁾

In redemption it is the original creation brought into being by the Word of God that is redeemed. Man of the original creation, receiving the Spirit bestowed by the Word, is made a partaker of the resurrection, flesh and all.⁽⁵⁵⁾ For Irenaeus, in the Eucharist the continuing appropriation of this redemption is realised; the Word of God continues to unite the Spirit with the material world

53. adv. haer. IV xviii 5; H. ii 205ff. Greek preserved by John of Damascus, Sacra Parallela. On the Greek phrase here, see below, note 61.

54. This is especially clear in the idea of the mingling of the Spirit with the created man of the earth. See above, pp. 612ff., 645ff., 668 and 675ff.

55. On the connection between the doctrine of the Eucharist in Irenaeus and the doctrine of redemption see esp. the several long notes by Harvey (ii 203, 204, 205, 206, 208, 209) and the article by d'Alès (art. cit., RSR 13 (1923), pp. 29 - 32).

for the salvation of the whole man.⁽⁵⁶⁾

Other references to the Eucharist in the adversus haereses bear out what we have just said. The significance of the bread and wine, at least in part, is that they are of God's creation,⁽⁵⁷⁾ and the cup is of mixed water and wine as a sign of the Spirit and the Word of the Father, who, 'united with the old substance of Adam's formation, bring about the living and perfect man.'⁽⁵⁸⁾ Finally, another passage makes plain the connection between the Eucharist, the redemption of man and the present work of the Word of God. The argument is as follows: Both man and the elements of the Eucharist, the bread and wine, are creatures of God; by the bread and wine, the body and blood of Christ, our bodies and our blood are nourished. The argument proceeds as follows:

56. Cf. 'The sacraments bring down to its utmost degree of concretion - though leaving the mystery still unveiled (surely Ochagavía intended 'veiled') - the visibility and presence of Jesus Christ which are kept in the Church' (Ochagavía, op. cit., p. 140); and 'Eucharistie ist Vergegenwärtigung der Inkarnation, Zuwendung der menschlichen Existenz Jesu unter dem Symbol des realen Genährtwerdens unseres Fleisches durch das Fleisch Christi, mit dem Ziel, unsere noch unvollkommene menschliche Natur durch den Heiligen Geist, der das Brot der Unsterblichkeit ist, auf die uns zugedachte Vollendung, die leib-seelische Unvergänglichkeit, vorzubereiten' (Joppich, op. cit., pp. 76f.).

57. adv. haer. IV xxxiii 2; H. ii 257.

58. adv. haer. V i 3; H. ii 317.

When, therefore, the mingled cup and the manufactured bread receives the Word of God (ἐπιδέχεται τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ) and becomes Eucharist and body of Christ, and from these the substance of our flesh (ἡ τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν ὑπόστασις) grows and consolidates, how can they say that the flesh is incapable of receiving the gift of God, that is, eternal life, flesh which is nourished with the Lord's body and blood and is part of him? (59)

The context is Irenaeus's discussion of the resurrection of the whole man including the flesh created from the dust of the earth. This is made possible by Christ and is mediated to man in faith in the Eucharist; it is a fore-taste of what will be here-after:

And in the way in which a cutting from the vine, when placed in the earth, bears fruit in its season, and a grain of wheat, falling into the ground and decomposing, rises in abundance through the Spirit of God which holds all things together; and then, through wisdom, becomes of use for men, and, receiving the Word of God (προσλαμβάνοντα τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ), becomes Eucharist, that is, the body and blood of Christ; in the same way our bodies, being nourished by it (sc. the Eucharist) and placed in the earth and decomposing in it, will arise at their proper time, the Word of God graciously granting resurrection to them to the glory of God the Father. (60)

59. adv. haer. V ii 2f.; H. ii 319 - 21. Greek preserved by John of Damascus, Sacra Parallela.

60. adv. haer. V ii 3; H. ii 322f. Greek preserved by John of Damascus, Sacra Parallela. 'through wisdom becomes of use for men': the Greek reads διὰ τῆς σοφίας τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς χρῆσιν. . . . τοῦ θεοῦ is to be omitted on the evidence of both the Armenian and Latin.

The whole discussion here hinges on the interpretation of the phrases ἐπιδέχεται τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ in the previous passage above, and προσλαμβάνόμενα τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ in the passage immediately above. In both cases λόγος has been taken to mean the Word and not simply the words of institution in the Eucharist.⁽⁶¹⁾ The whole substance of Irenaeus's argument is that what takes place in the Eucharist applies a fortiori to the whole of man; the Eucharist is a microcosm of the redemption made possible by the Incarnation. With this 'Word' coincides rather than 'word'. This interpretation is further strengthened by the parallel in the second passage above between the action of the Word in the Eucharist and the action of the Word in 'graciously granting resurrection.' Irenaeus's argument seems to presuppose that the same Word is meant in both cases. In these passages it is clear that the Eucharist

61. In an earlier passage we hear of the bread 'receiving the invocation of God (προσλαμβάνενος τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τοῦ θεοῦ)' (adv. haer. IV xviii 5; H. ii 205; see above p. 711). This would appear to suggest the act of men calling upon God, and imply the possibility in the present passages that the words of institution, or at least the words of the eucharistic prayer are meant. However, the earlier passage is not necessarily to be interpreted in that way; it depends on whether the genitive 'of God' is an objective or a subjective genitive. The whole thrust of the other passages is that the bread receives something from God (and therefore mortal man receives the Spirit). While this is not the immediately obvious meaning of προσλαμβάνενος τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τοῦ θεοῦ, it is not impossible and would coincide well with Irenaeus's designation of the Word of God as God's 'vox' (adv. haer. V xvi 1; H. ii 367;

is no simple remembrance of Christ's past work, but rather the place where the Word of God continues to manifest his redemption.

The connection between the two themes of the Eucharist, as the Church's offering of the first-fruits, and as the place of the Word's continuing redemptive activity, lies in the fact that Christ is the first-begotten from the dead. Irenaeus does not say this in these words, but his references to the Church's offering as the new covenant of the new offering, and as the first-fruits of God's gifts in the new covenant⁽⁶²⁾ would seem to preclude the idea that the Church's offering is simply a continuation of the offering of the first-fruits of the ground; it is the offering of a redeemed creation, of which Christ is the first-born. If this is correct, then the two themes are closely linked: in the Eucharist the Church gives thanks to God for the redeeming activity of Christ⁽⁶³⁾ and receives in itself in faith the guarantee of the continuing redemptive activity of the Word of God.

The point which is of primary importance for our present purpose is the observation that, although the work of redemption on the cross was a once-for-all work that

61. (contd.) see above pp. 567f).

62. adv. haer. IV xvii 5; H. ii 197ff.

63. This is not far removed from the idea expressed by Paul in I Cor. 11.26: 'For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes.'

cannot be repeated, the effectual manifestation of that redemption among men continues to be the work of the same Word of God. The continuation of salvation history after the resurrection and ascension, the period of the gradual realisation of the universal rule of Christ continues to come under the control of that same Word of God who was active in creation, revelation and redemption. In connection with the Eucharist, nothing is said about what the Church accomplishes: the offering of the Church is not for God's sake but for man's, 'lest he prove unproductive and ungrateful.'⁽⁶⁴⁾ The emphasis lies on the present activity of the Word who gives life to men. It is not even the bread and wine which save, but the bread and wine which, 'receiving the Word of God', give life to our bodies. The Eucharist is a thanksgiving for the victory of God in an offering of the first-fruits of that victory; a thanksgiving for a world redeemed through Christ and a participation in that redemption.

The continuing work of Christ in the on-going salvation history raises in an acute form, however, the problems associated with the second area of discussion mentioned above: The role of the Church's tradition and faith in relation to the work of Christ. We are concerned here with the particular problem of the relationship of the tradition of the Church to the lordship of Christ, and we shall

64. adv. haer. IV xvii 5; H. ii 198.

consider the tradition only on that basis.⁽⁶⁵⁾ In order to understand what Irenaeus means by tradition we must go right back to the polemical task of Irenaeus, for the carrying out of which the concept of the tradition was so important. Then when we understand what Irenaeus means by 'tradition' we shall be able to see its relationship to the lordship of Christ in the Church and the propagation of man's redemption.

The polemical task of Irenaeus was to expose and overthrow the so-called knowledge that had no real claim to the name.⁽⁶⁶⁾ The essential content of the true knowledge, at least as it emerges from the discussion in Book III of the adversus haereses, is that there is only

65. On the tradition in Irenaeus see, e.g., Brox (op. cit., 69 - 167 - the most detailed study), Bengsch (op. cit., pp. 62 - 74), Ochagavía (op. cit., pp. 174 - 205) and the articles by B. Reynders ('Paradosis. Le progrès de l'idée de tradition jusqu'à saint Irénée', in RTAM 5(1933), pp. 155 - 91) and H. Holstein ('La tradition des Apôtres chez saint Irénée', in RSR 36(1949), pp. 229 - 70). On the tradition generally in the early Church see also G.L. Prestige, Fathers and Heretics. Six Studies in Dogmatic Faith with Prologue and Epilogue (London, 1940; = The Bampton Lectures for 1940), ch. 1; Y.M.-J. Congar, Tradition and Traditions. An historical and a theological essay (London, 1966), pp. 23 - 42; R.P.C. Hanson, Tradition in the Early Church (London, 1962).

66. Cf. the original title of the adversus haereses.

one God and only one Christ.⁽⁶⁷⁾ To consider only the second of these, we may characterise Irenaeus's task in another way as the defence and protection of the Church's understanding of Christ from the perversions of the Gnostics. For the correct understanding of Christ Irenaeus takes his stand on Scripture. With regard to the Old Testament Irenaeus sees in the cross of Christ the key to its interpretation,⁽⁶⁸⁾ and he is certain that 'the Son of God is sown as seed (inseminatus est) everywhere in his scriptures.'⁽⁶⁹⁾ On the other hand the Scriptures themselves all point to Christ, and the Old Testament is fulfilled in the New.⁽⁷⁰⁾ Irenaeus is well aware that it is not always easy to interpret Scripture, but in the more difficult passages the method to be followed is to interpret what is not clear in the light of what is unambiguous.⁽⁷¹⁾ To Irenaeus it appears that the whole of Scripture lies open and self-sufficient for its interpretation.⁽⁷²⁾

Despite his protestations about the clarity of the

67. Cf. the divisions of Book III in its major sections as indicated by the section titles printed by Sagnard: 'un seul Dieu' and 'un seul Christ'.

68. See above p.591 : adv. haer. IV xxvi 1; H. ii 234f.

69. adv. haer. IV x 1; H. ii 172; cf. the whole of IV xxiii 1 - xxv 3; H. ii 230 - 34.

70. See above, pp. 591ff.

71. adv. haer. II x 1; H. i 272.

72. Cf. adv. haer. II xxvii 2; H. i 348.

Scriptures, Irenaeus was still forced to defend them against misrepresentation, misinterpretation and even falsification, not to mention spurious works written by the Gnostics. The major section in which Irenaeus undertakes this is the opening chapters of Book III of the adversus haereses. To defend the Scriptures Irenaeus is forced to go outside the Scriptures themselves, thus showing that they are not in fact their own interpreter. The real key to the understanding of the Scriptures is the Rule of Faith or Rule of Truth. A detailed study of this concept is not called for here,⁽⁷³⁾ but it leads us to a

73. Since the Rule is the guide to the interpretation of Scripture it is clearly not to be equated with Scripture; at the same time the very flexibility of its formulation indicates that it is not a creed in the strict sense of the word. The Rule is probably best described as 'was die Kirche glaubt, die ganze einsichtige und geoffenbarte Wahrheit' (Brox, op. cit., p. 109). It is everything that belongs to the Truth as it has been handed down from the apostles and is maintained in the Church. Hanson sums up the concept thus: 'In the rule of faith we have a key to what the Church thought the Scriptures came to, where it was, so to speak, that their weight fell, what was their drift. This interpretation of their drift was itself a tradition, a way of handling the Scriptures, a way of living in them and being exposed to their effect, which, while not an original part of the Christian Gospel, not itself the paradosis par excellence, had been developed from the Gospel itself, from its heart, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit as an essential part of the existence of the Christian faith in history' (op. cit., p. 128).

point of interpretation of Scripture that is located outside Scripture in the tradition of the Church.⁽⁷⁴⁾ In the early chapters of Book III of the adversus haereses Irenaeus distinguishes between Scripture and tradition in order to show that the Gnostics pervert the plain meaning of Scripture by having recourse to their secret traditions, whereas the genuine tradition of the Church is open for all to see.⁽⁷⁵⁾ The distinction made here is a little misleading, however, for Irenaeus does not set Scripture and tradition over against each other. Speaking about the apostolic tradition in the opening chapters of Book III of the adversus haereses, Irenaeus considers some of the staunch upholders of that tradition and then goes on to add that many of the barbarian nations assent to the tradition, 'having salvation written on their hearts by the Spirit,

74. 'Tradition' is a somewhat more restricted term in Irenaeus than Rule of Truth, referring to the teaching handed down by the apostles. Thus, the Rule of Truth embraces Scripture, creeds and the more limited apostolic tradition.

75. adv. haer. IIIii 1f.; H. ii 7f. Irenaeus accuses the Gnostics of using their traditions to interpret Scripture, but in fact he does precisely the same himself. The difference between them lies in the fact that for Irenaeus the tradition is not secret but open, and in fact that Scripture itself is written tradition, that is, there is no conflict between the two for both come from the same source. It was Tertullian who saw the weakness of Irenaeus's argument against the Gnostics and shifted the ground from the exegesis of Scripture to denying the Gnostics the right to use the Scriptures at all (de prae. haer. 15ff.).

without paper or ink, and carefully preserving the ancient tradition.'⁽⁷⁶⁾ Irenaeus then goes on to outline the content of the tradition preserved by them, and it is belief in those very elements of the apostolic teaching that Irenaeus has been defending from Scripture; that is, belief in the one God and his saving activity in Christ. There is, then, no conflict in Irenaeus's mind between the meaning of Scripture and the content of the apostolic tradition. Indeed, when it comes to the writings of the New Testament, both they and the apostolic tradition come from one and the same authoritative source: Christ himself. Jesus Christ is the Truth and the Apostles were disciples of the Truth,⁽⁷⁷⁾ and therefore, what they preach is true; but 'what they then preached, they afterwards, by the will of God, handed on to us in the Scriptures (*postea vero per Dei voluntatem in scripturis nobis tradiderunt*).'⁽⁷⁸⁾ The apostolic tradition and the Scriptures are therefore in complete agreement, even though, from the point of view of exegesis, Irenaeus uses the tradition as the guide to the interpretation of Scripture.⁽⁷⁹⁾

76. adv. haer. III iv 2; H. ii 16.

77. adv. haer. III v 1; H. ii 18; cf. II xxx 9; H. i 368.

78. adv. haer. III i 1; H. ii 2; cf. III v 1; H. ii 18.

79. Cf. 'Schriftliche und mündliche Verkündigung der Apostel haben denselben Inhalt und denselben Ursprung. Also ist sachlich und historisch kein Platz für eine geheime Tradition' (Bengsch, op. cit., p. 65). Cf. Holstein, art. cit., RSR 36 (1949), Brox, op. cit., pp. 98ff., Ochagavía, op. cit., pp. 195 - 201.

Scripture and tradition, then, both stem from the Apostles, and from them alone. It follows therefore that Scripture can be rightly understood only in the Apostolic succession; and this is precisely what Irenaeus goes on to say. To the apostles Christ entrusted his teaching and his mission;⁽⁸⁰⁾ to the apostles also was given the gift of the Spirit by Christ in order to consolidate their authority and give them perfect knowledge.⁽⁸¹⁾ The tradition, oral and written, that was given to the apostles was not a secret tradition as the Gnostics maintained,⁽⁸²⁾ but the open tradition of the Church,⁽⁸³⁾ the apostolicity and truth of which were guaranteed by the succession of presbyters and bishops in the Churches down from the apostles.⁽⁸⁴⁾ As an excellent example of this succession which guarantees the validity of the tradition Irenaeus cites the list of the Bishops at Rome.⁽⁸⁵⁾ This brings Irenaeus to his own day:

80. adv. haer. III pf.; H. ii 1.

81. adv. haer. III i 1; H. ii 2.

82. adv. haer. III ii 1f.; H. ii 7f.

83. Cf. III xiv 2; H. ii 76.

84. adv. haer. III ii 2; H. ii 7f.; cf. Frag. II; H. ii 471.

85. adv. haer. III iii 1 - 3; H. ii 8 - 11. The much debated question of the authority and primacy of Rome does not concern us here. Irenaeus mentions Rome as an example, the best example he knows of, of the ideal loyalty to the apostolic tradition. Agreement with Rome is enjoined not because Rome is Rome, but because Rome upholds the tradition handed down by the apostles in all its purity. Sagnard (Irénée, pp. 101 - 06) discusses some recent contributions up to the time of writing (1951). See also Hanson, *op. cit.*, pp. 144 - 46.

By this order and succession the tradition and proclamation of the truth which is in the Church from the apostles have come down to us. And this is the fullest proof that there is one and the same life-giving faith, which has been preserved in the Church from the apostles until now, and handed on in truth.⁽⁸⁶⁾

All that Irenaeus says about the apostolic tradition is said in order to prove the invalidity of the secret, Gnostic tradition by which the Gnostics interpreted Scripture. Several other important things for our present purpose, however, follow from Irenaeus's writing on tradition. Most important is the fact that the Scriptures, and hence the Christ to whom they point, can be understood only in the apostolic succession of the Church. This has important consequences for the relationship of the tradition to the lordship of Christ, namely, that it can be known only in the concrete, historical continuity of the apostolic tradition. Bengsch has already pointed out that Irenaeus's attitude to tradition means that 'there is, however, no non-historical access to the Revelation.'⁽⁸⁷⁾ There is no other way to the truth about Jesus than through the historical Church as God's continuing agent in the on-going salvation history. There is no escape from the reality of history as the place of reception of salvation. The

86. adv. haer. III iii 3; H. ii 11f.

87. 'Es gibt, aber, keinen ungeschichtlichen Zugang zur Offenbarung, und dieser Zugang ist vorgeschrieben durch die Zeit der Heilsgeschichte, in der einer lebt' (Bensch, op. cit., p. 72).

Gnostics go astray because they attempt to bypass the historical route to Christ.⁽⁸⁸⁾ There is another corollary of Irenaeus's understanding of tradition, however, which is that there is no other access to the present lordship of Christ either, than by means of the concrete expression of the apostolic tradition in the Church. Christ's lordship over the Church is mediated to men concretely, one might even say, incarnationally, in the Church and nowhere else.⁽⁸⁹⁾

The fact that the true lordship of Christ can be acknowledged only in the Church that maintains purely the apostolic tradition leads us to ask whether Irenaeus understands the acceptance of the tradition as the true response of man to the gospel? The answer is an emphatic No: the response of man is not acceptance of the tradition but faith in God. There is a close correlation between the two as we shall see but they are not identical nor interchangeable. To anticipate a little, but at the same time to make clear the relevance of this discussion to the lordship of Christ in the Church, it will be shown that the lordship of Christ finds its correlative response in man's faith in God not in the maintaining of the tradition. The tradition, important as it is, is about Christ and

88. *ibid.*, pp. 73f.

89. Cf. 'By linking Scripture to the visible Church embodied in the episcopacy, Irenaeus's doctrine of revelation reaches its utmost degree of concretion' (Ochagavía, *op. cit.*, p. 180).

does not supplant him or in any way replace him.

The importance of faith in the theology of Irenaeus cannot be over-estimated. For Irenaeus faith means primarily a trust and confidence in God. This emerges very clearly in the fact that Abraham is used as a type of the Church's faith no fewer than seven times in the adversus haereses and three times in the Demonstratio.⁽⁹⁰⁾ The following passage makes clear the parallel that Irenaeus draws between the faith of Abraham, who trusted God and obeyed him, and the faith of the Church, which trusts God and is justified by faith:

So he (sc. the Word) fulfilled the promise made to Abraham by God, that he would make his seed like the stars of heaven; for Christ did this by being born of the Virgin who came of Abraham's seed, and setting up as lights in the world those who believe in him, justifying the Gentiles through the same faith with Abraham. For 'Abraham believed God, and it was reputed to him unto justice;' in like manner we too are justified by believing God, for 'a just man shall live by faith.' So 'not through the Law was the promise to Abraham, but through faith.' For Abraham was justified by faith, and 'the law is not made for the just man.' So too are we justified not through the Law, but through the faith of him to whom witness was borne by the Law and the prophets whom the Word of God brought to us.⁽⁹¹⁾

90. adv. haer. IV v 3 - 5; H. ii 156f.; IV vii 2f.; H. ii 163; IV viii 1f.; H. ii 165f.; IV xiii 4; H. ii 183; IV xxi 1; H. ii 225; IV xxv 1; H. ii 233; V xxxii 2; H. ii 414f.; Dem. 24; 35; 93.

91. Dem. 35. The quotations are, in order: Gen. 15.6 (Cf. Rom. 4.3; Gal. 3.6); Hab. 2.4 (as quoted in Rom. 1.17; Gal. 3.11); Rom. 4.13 (an inaccurate quotation); I Tim. 1.9.

Earlier in the Demonstratio⁽⁹²⁾ Irenaeus lays even greater stress on Abraham's faith as his absolute trust in God, and, in the Church, Christ raises up descendants to Abraham in their likeness to Abraham's faith.⁽⁹³⁾

While there is no doubt that the primary meaning of 'faith' for Irenaeus is the relationship of trust and confidence in God, it is equally certain that in some passages 'faith' means the content of the Church's teaching, and is virtually an equivalent for the tradition, as seen for example in the use of the two terms 'Rule of faith' and 'Rule of truth'.⁽⁹⁴⁾ We are concerned here with the relationship between these two aspects of faith as understood by Irenaeus, that is, with the relationship between faith as trust and confidence in God and faith as the equivalent of the apostolic tradition. The distinction between them emerges with the greatest clarity in two statements of Irenaeus about the purpose of the Demonstratio:

As it is, since we are at present time distant in body from each other, we have not delayed, so far as may be to commune with you a little in writing, and to set forth in brief the preaching of the truth, to confirm your faith.⁽⁹⁵⁾

92. Dem. 24.

93. Dem. 93; cf. adv. haer. IV vii 2; H. ii 163.

94. In the following passages 'faith' seems to mean 'the faith', that is the doctrinal expression of man's faith in God: adv. haer. I x 1 - 3; H. i 90 - 94; III pf.; H. ii 1; III i 1; H. ii 2; III iii 2; H. ii 9; III iii 3; H. ii 10; V pf.; H. ii 313f.; V xx 1; H. ii 378; Dem. 3; 6. On the Rule of Faith see above, notes 73, 74.

95. Dem. 1; cf. adv. haer. III xii 14; H. ii 69.

Here, the preaching of the truth, that is, the apostolic tradition, is not to be identified with faith, even though it serves to strengthen the reader's faith. The distinction between the tradition and faith can be seen even more clearly in the second passage:

So, if the prophets have prophesied that the Son of God was to appear on earth, . . . and the Lord took on himself all these prophecies, our belief in him was well-grounded, and true the tradition of the preaching, that is, the witness of the apostles. (96)

Because of the truth of the tradition, man may have confidence in God.

While faith and tradition can be distinguished they in fact belong together intimately, for faith rests on the sure foundation provided by a secure apostolic tradition. However, this never leads Irenaeus to identify faith with the tradition. The inter-relationships of the two can be seen in the following:

So, . . . we must keep strictly, without deviation, the rule of faith, and carry out the commands of God, believing in God, and fearing him, because he is Lord, and loving him, because he is Father. Action, then, is preserved by faith, because 'unless you believe', says Isaiah, 'you shall not continue' (Is. 7.9); (97) and faith is given by truth, since faith rests upon

96. Dem. 86.

97. The Armenian text here renders the LXX (you will not understand) but it is possible that Irenaeus translated from a version following the Massoretic text (you will not continue), as he does in a quotation from Is. 9.5 - 6 in Dem. 54. 'Continue' fits much better in the present context. See the notes of Smith and Froidevaux

reality: for we shall believe what really is, as it is, and, believing what really is, as it is for ever, keep a firm hold on our assent to it. Since, then, it is faith that maintains our salvation, one must take great care of this sustenance, to have a true perception of reality.⁽⁹⁸⁾

We see here again some of the ambivalence concerning the word 'faith': as trust and confidence, and as the faith handed down by the apostles. Nevertheless, it is clear that the heavy emphasis that Irenaeus here places on the tradition is occasioned not by the fact that the tradition is true absolutely, but by the fact that if the truth of the tradition is undermined at any point, then man's trust and confidence in God are shaken.

Even though Irenaeus understands the tradition as vitally necessary, it is, in the final analysis, only a support for faith. It is a true and strong support, and as handed down in Scripture is 'the foundation and pillar of our faith';⁽⁹⁹⁾ but the lordship of Christ in his Church finds its appropriate response not simply in the acceptance of the tradition, but in faith in God. Christ is to be

97. (contd.) ad loc. Smith considers that the Armenian translator emended the text to agree with the LXX, and himself emends accordingly. Froidevaux and Robinson retain the reading of the Armenian.

98. Dem. 3.

99. adv. haer. III i 1; H. ii 2; cf. I Tim. 3.15 where it is said that the Church is the pillar and foundation of the truth. Cf. also adv. haer. III xi 8; H. ii 47.

found not in the tradition but through the tradition. Christ reigns as Lord and King and head of the Church. Man must accept the tradition of the Church as the truth, and indeed there is no other route by which man can come to know Christ, but ultimately man's response is faith in God through Jesus Christ; he comes to faith through the apostolic faith maintained in the Church. Christ reigns even over the tradition about himself, though he can be reached by no other path. In the last resort, however, as Irenaeus understands it, what matters is man's present response to the present lordship of Christ in his Church.

Finally in this section, we turn to consider the role of the Spirit in relation to the continuing activity of Christ in the on-going salvation history. As we have seen above, ⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ the Spirit was bestowed on Jesus by the Father, in accordance with the promise that God would pour out his Spirit on his servants. Jesus, endowed with the Spirit, became the means by which the Spirit might become accustomed to dwelling among men. Through Christ, the Spirit has become united with God's creation, in particular, making possible the resurrection of the whole man through being united with the flesh and the soul.

The Spirit has been poured out on the Church by Christ in the last days in accordance with the promise made through the prophets and by Christ himself when he said he would

100. See above, pp. 612ff.

send the Paraclete.⁽¹⁰¹⁾ The Spirit was first poured out on the apostles at Pentecost, and they were perfected by the Spirit and equipped by it to carry out their tasks.⁽¹⁰²⁾ Eventually, the gift of the Spirit was extended to the Gentiles as well.⁽¹⁰³⁾ The Spirit that has been poured out on the Church is one and the same Spirit of God who has been active in creation and revelation and in the Incarnation.⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ Furthermore, the sphere of the Spirit's activity is co-extensive with the extent of the Church, so that Irenaeus can say that 'where the Church is, there also is the Spirit of God; and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church and every kind of grace (ubi enim ecclesia, ibi et Spiritus Dei; et ubi Spiritus Dei, illic ecclesia, et omnia gratia).'⁽¹⁰⁵⁾ The gift of the Spirit is fundamental to the establishment of the Church.⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ In short, as with the true tradition, the Spirit is the possession only of the Church that is descended from Christ and the apostles in clear succession.⁽¹⁰⁷⁾ The Spirit is handed on in the Church by the apostles,⁽¹⁰⁸⁾

101. adv. haer. III xii 1; H. ii 53; III xvii 1ff.; H. ii 92ff.; IV xxxi 2; H. ii 253.

102. adv. haer. III xii 1f.; H. ii 54; III xii 5; H. ii 58; III xvi 1; H. ii 82; IV pf. 3; H. ii 145.

103. adv. haer. III xii 14; H. ii 69; III xii 15; H. ii 71f.; Dem. 89.

104. adv. haer. III xxi 4; H. ii 115; IV ix 2; H. ii 170; IV xx 6; H. ii 218; IV xxxiii 9; H. ii 264; IV xxxiii 15; H. ii 269.

105. adv. haer. III xxiv 1; H. ii 132; cf. IV xxxvi 2; H. ii 278.

106. Dem. 41

107. adv. haer. III xxiv 1; H. ii 132.

108. adv. haer. III xii 15; H. ii 71; IV xxxviii 2; H. ii 294.

and is given to the individual believer in baptism. (109)

The work of the Spirit in the Church is variously described as expounding the work of Christ (110) and things past, present and future, (111) and as enabling man to grow to his true stature. (112) In the Church is also set out 'the intimate union with Christ (*commutatio Christi*), that is, the Holy Spirit, and down-payment of incorruption, the strengthening of our faith and the ladder of our ascent to God. (113)

The relationship of this manifold activity of the Spirit to the lordship of Christ is clearly expressed in a number of passages. Christ is both head of the Church and head of the Spirit as well, through which the Church sees and hears and speaks. (114) The Spirit is the means by which the lordship of Christ is mediated to the Church: Therefore the baptism of our rebirth comes through these three articles, granting us rebirth unto God the Father, through his Son, by the Holy Spirit. For those who are bearers of the Spirit of God are

109. Dem. 3; 42.

110. adv. haer. I x 1; H. i 90. Dem. 7.

111. adv. haer. IV xxxiii 1; H. ii 256; IV xxxiii 7; H. ii 262; Dem. 67.

112. adv. haer. III xvii 3; H. ii 93; IV xx 4; H. ii 216; IV xxxviii 3; H. ii 296.

113. adv. haer. III xxiv 1; H. ii 131. The texts all read '*commutatio*', which is retained by Sagnard without comment and translated as: '*l'intimité d'union*'. Harvey emends to '*communicatio*' on the grounds that the Spirit is the evidence of our communion with Christ, not of the atonement. This seems to represent a misunderstanding of the meaning of '*commutatio*', here

led to the Word, that is, to the Son; but the Son takes them and presents them to the Father; and the Father confers incorruptibility. So without the Spirit there is no seeing the Word of God, and without the Son there is no approaching the Father; for the Son is the knowledge of the Father, and knowledge of the Son is through the Holy Spirit. But the Son, according to the Father's good-pleasure, administers the Spirit charismatically as the Father will, to those to whom he will. (115)

So far as Irenaeus is concerned, the Son bestows the Spirit only in the Church descended from the apostles.

In this section we have been led again and again to two particular things. One is the continuing activity of the Word of God, both in the creatio continua and in the realisation of redemption in man - not of a new redemption, but the effective power of the one redemption won on the cross. This is still the work of the same Word of God. On the other hand, we have seen that this salvation is not to be appropriated by man apart from the concrete reality of the Church that stands in the line of the apostolic tradition. Christ continues to make his redemption known, as with the great act of salvation itself, by, with and under the material forms that are part of history. It is through the Church, not as a spiritual community distinct from the historical and hierarchical structures, but as a spiritual community within the concreteness of persons and organization, that the Word continues to make himself known,

113. (contd.) meaning 'an intimate interchange'.

114. adv. haer. V xx 2; H. ii 380.

115. Dem. 7.

especially in the Eucharist, leading men onwards towards their fullness of perfection. Christocentric salvation history is as much a reality in the life of the Church as it ever was in the work of the prophets and patriarchs and in the Incarnation.

VII THE CONSUMMATION

We have now come almost to the conclusion of Christ's work. It remains only to outline briefly Irenaeus's understanding of the role of Christ in the events associated with the end of the present age, and to show how salvation history eventually reaches its appointed conclusion with all the promises of God fulfilled. Most of what Irenaeus has to say on the subject of the consummation is contained in the concluding chapters of the adversus haereses. It may well be the case, as Loofs maintained,⁽¹⁾ that in these chapters Irenaeus was drawing on sources. Indeed, at one point Irenaeus specifically names Papias.⁽²⁾ It does not follow from this, however, that the concluding chapters of the adversus haereses are any less Irenaeian than the remainder of the work. As we shall see, even the millenarian passages do not form a foreign body in the work as a whole, but

1. Loofs (Theophilus von Antiochien, pp. 310 - 38) reckoned that the source IQS/E (i.e. the Presbyters and Papias, who make up one source) has influenced most of the section adv. haer. V xxv - xxxvi.
2. adv. haer. V xxxiii 4; H. ii 419.

provide, rather, the logical outcome to the whole of salvation history as it is presented in the remainder of the work and in the Demonstratio.⁽³⁾ From whatever immediate source Irenaeus drew his material, a great deal of the descriptive imagery for the time of the end is drawn from the strongly apocalyptic passages of the New Testament and sections of the Book of Daniel.⁽⁴⁾

Already by his triumph over death Christ reigns, but Irenaeus looks forward to the time when Christ will reign visibly on earth. This will come about after a period of great distress and disaster which will be the last endeavours of the powers of evil, symbolised by the Beast and Antichrist, to avoid their doom.⁽⁵⁾ Just before the end, rule will be shared by ten rulers who will be superseded by the great apostate who bears the number 666,⁽⁶⁾ and who will reign for three and a half years.⁽⁷⁾ It is important to note that even

3. Both Bengsch (op. cit., pp. 164ff.) and Joppich (op. cit., pp. 128ff.) point out that the primary question is not where did Irenaeus obtain his material, but to what use did he put it?

4. The most important of the Biblical passages used by Irenaeus are:

Daniel 2.33, 34, 41 - 45;	<u>adv. haer.</u> V xxvi 1; H. ii 395.
Daniel 7.8, 20 - 25;	<u>adv. haer.</u> V xxv 3; H. ii 391f.
Daniel 8.12, 23f.; 9.27;	<u>adv. haer.</u> V xxv 4; H. ii 393.
Matthew 24.15 - 17, 21;	<u>adv. haer.</u> V xxv 2; H. ii 391.
II Thess. 2.3, 4, 8 - 12;	<u>adv. haer.</u> V xxv 1f.; H. ii 391f.; V xxviii 2; H. ii 400f.
Revelation 13.2 - 18;	<u>adv. haer.</u> V xxviii 2; H. ii 401f.
Revelation 17.12 - 14;	<u>adv. haer.</u> V xxvi 1; H. ii 394.
Revelation 21.1 - 4;	<u>adv. haer.</u> V xxxv 2; H. ii 425.

this comes under the whole scheme of salvation history, for God sends this ruler 'at the proper time (apto tempore).'(8)

It is also important to note that the Antichrist and the Beast are said to recapitulate all error, apostasy and deceit,(9) so that there is, in a limited sense, a kind of Damnation history alongside the salvation history, but this Damnation history is related to only the final phases of salvation history and is strictly subservient to it.(10)

This will complete the 6,000 years of the world's history, 'for in as many days as the world was made, in that many thousands of years it will be finished (συντελεσται) For the day of the Lord is as a thousand years; and in six days the things that were made were finished.'(11) To this, as we shall see, Irenaeus adds the seventh day as the millennial rule of Christ. In doing this he produced for the first time in Christian literature a sweeping view of the

5. adv. haer. V xxv 2ff.; H. ii 391ff.

6. adv. haer. V xxvi 1; H. ii 394f.; V xxx 2; H. ii 408.

7. adv. haer. V xxv 3; H. ii 392; V xxx 4; H. ii 410.

8. adv. haer. V xxviii 2; H. ii 401.

9. adv. haer. V xxv 1; H. ii 391; V xxv 4; H. ii 393; V xxviii 2; H. ii 401f.; V xxix 2; H. ii 404f.; V xxx 1; H. ii 406.

10. Cf the remarks made above, p. 693, n. 249.

11. adv. haer. V xxviii 3; H. ii 402f. Greek preserved by Andrew of Caesarea, Comm.in Apoc. Irenaeus preserves another tradition about the end of the world: that it will take place when the number of the elect is complete (adv. haer. II xxxiii 5; H. i 380).

total history of man of 7,000 years, followed by eternity.⁽¹²⁾

Irenaeus regards the duration of Antichrist's reign as a time of testing,⁽¹³⁾ and at the end of the three and a half years Christ will return, instituting the judgement and fulfilling the promises made by God to Abraham.⁽¹⁴⁾ In these three, the return, the judgement, and the fulfilment of the promises, we shall see many clear associations with the preceding events of salvation history.

The return of Christ institutes the visible rule of Christ. Of this the Church is the promise; that is, the Church itself looks forward to the consummation.⁽¹⁵⁾ In this visible kingdom the prophets, who looked forward too in hope to the visible appearance of Christ, share, having their hopes at last realised. The prophets sowed, the Church reaps, and sower and reaper rejoice together in the

12. See A. Luneau, *op. cit.*, pp. 93 - 103. Where earlier writers saw either the millennial rule (Papias and Justin) or 6,000 years followed by a rest (Ps.-Barnabas), Irenaeus combines the two. Luneau suggests that it was his doctrine of recapitulation that prompted Irenaeus to do this, but it is probably more correct to see it as the outcome of the doctrine of the divine economy of salvation. So too with the doctrine of the ages of the world, earlier writers had seen the stages, but Irenaeus sees them as part of a total movement: 'ils forment quatre etapes d'une pedagogie qui conduit l'homme de l'enfance a l'état adulte dans le Christ' (*ibid.*; p. 96).

13. *adv. haer.* V xxviii 4; H. ii 403.

14. *adv. haer.* V xxx 4; H. ii 410; cf. V xxv 2f.; H. ii 391f.

15. *Dem.* 61.

kingdom of Christ; ⁽¹⁶⁾ and there is one reward for all the workers in God's vineyard. ⁽¹⁷⁾ So the return of Christ fulfils the hopes of both the prophets and the Church.

The role of Christ as judge ⁽¹⁸⁾ is the continuation of one aspect of Christ's work as the Word that he has already exercised on Sodom and Gommorah ⁽¹⁹⁾ and on the whole world at the time of Noah. ⁽²⁰⁾ Christ is at once both judge and Saviour. ⁽²¹⁾ In this we have another indication of the determination of Irenaeus to present one Christ in all stages of salvation history, for Irenaeus's solution to the problem of the contrast between the saving activity of God and his just judgement is not to separate the God of the Old Testament from the God of the New Testament (with Marcion), nor to contrast the lowly first coming of Christ with his return in glory and judgement (with Justin Martyr), ⁽²²⁾ but to understand the judgement as operative for all men on the basis of their faith in Christ or lack of it, ⁽²³⁾ men virtually judge themselves. The ultimate fate of all transgressors and apostates is to be burned with fire. ⁽²⁴⁾

16. adv. haer. IV xxv 3; H. ii 234.

17. adv. haer. IV xxxvi 7; H. ii 284.

18. Cf. III xii 7; H. ii 61; Dem. 41; 62.

19. Dem. 44; cf. adv. haer. III vi 1; H. ii 21.

20. adv. haer. IV xxxvi 4; H. ii 279f.

21. adv. haer. IV xl 2; H. ii 302; cf. III iv 2; H. ii 16.

22. See above, pp. 247f.

23. adv. haer. V xxvii 1f.; H. ii 397ff.; Dem. 56; 69. See esp. Houssiau, op. cit., pp. 135 - 39.

24. adv. haer. II xxviii 7; H. i 356f.; V xxvi 2; H. ii 396.

It is in the promises of God made to Abraham that we see most clearly the completion of salvation history. God promised to Abraham that he would give to Abraham's descendants the land of Canaan.⁽²⁵⁾ Since this promise had not been fulfilled up to that time, Irenaeus considered that it would be honoured 'in the resurrection of the righteous.'⁽²⁶⁾ Irenaeus understands that the promise quite literally applies to the inheritance of this material world. This links closely with the resurrection of the flesh, of course.⁽²⁷⁾ In conformity with these ideas, the return of Christ is interpreted literally: he will return 'in the same flesh in which he also suffered, revealing the Father's glory.'⁽²⁸⁾ The same idea is supported by Irenaeus's interpretation of the promise of Jesus to his disciples that he would not drink of the fruit of the vine until he should drink it new in the Father's kingdom (Mt. 26.29). On the basis of this Irenaeus argues as follows:

For he cannot be understood as drinking the produce of the vine, being with his disciples in a place above the heavens, nor again do they who drink exist without flesh; for it is a characteristic of the flesh and not⁽²⁹⁾ of the spirit that it receives drinks from the vine.

The promised inheritance of Abraham is to be received on the

25. adv. haer. V xxxii 2; H. ii 414; cf. Dem. 24.

26. ibid.

27. See above, pp. 673 - 75.

28. adv. haer. III xvi 8; H. ii 90.

29. adv. haer. V xxxiii 1; H. ii 416.

earth,⁽³⁰⁾ and the true descendants of Abraham are those who have faith in Christ, i.e., the Church.⁽³¹⁾ Quite appropriately, therefore, salvation history has its conclusion in history itself.

Most important of all, the consummation will bring to its appropriate conclusion the growth and development of man. Man redeemed by Christ will continue to grow. Already the peace that will eventually embrace the whole animal kingdom as well as man is foreshadowed in the effects of belief in Christ among men, 'for those who were before most perverse, to the extent of omitting no work of ungodliness, coming to know Christ, and believing him, no sooner believed than they were changed to the extent of omitting no superabundance, even, of justice; so great is the change wrought by faith in Christ, the Son of God, in those who believe in him.'⁽³²⁾ Not only are the signs of growth already evident, but the growth continues in Christ's earthly kingdom. Even

30. adv. haer. V xxxi 1f.; H. ii 411ff.; V xxxiii 4; H. ii 419.

31. adv. haer. V xxxii 2; H. ii 415. See above, pp. 725ff.

32. Dem. 61, and of. the whole of section 61. The point made by Irenaeus is in elucidation of Is. 11.6, quoted in Dem. 59. Curiously, Irenaeus appears to present a slightly different interpretation in the adversus haereses from that presented in the Demonstratio. Quoting the same passage from Isaiah in adv. haer. V xxxiii 4; H. ii 418f., Irenaeus interprets the peace as referring to the time of the general resurrection, although acknowledging that some people interpret it symbolically. In the Demonstratio Irenaeus again leaves room for both interpretations but now his own emphasis lies clearly on what we might call 'realized eschatology'.

then men still move towards perfection. Consequently, Irenaeus maintains that certain persons who derive their doctrines from heretical sources 'are ignorant of God's arrangements (dispositiones) and of the mystery of the resurrection of the righteous and the kingdom, which is the beginning of incorruption, through which kingdom they who shall have become worthy little by little become accustomed to comprehend God (paulatim assuescunt capere Deum)'.⁽³³⁾ A little later Irenaeus makes the same point about man's final growth, on the grounds that the ideal conditions

32. (contd.) In fact the contrast is not as great as it seems at first sight. The clue to Irenaeus's real intention lies in the distinction he draws in both cases between animals and men. In the adversus haereses he rejects the interpretation of the passage that would interpret it solely in allegorical terms of peace between men in the Church. The truth of that peace he admits, but the peace of the animals will come at the end of time in the restoration of creation. So also in the Demonstratio the same distinction is made. At the beginning of ch. 61 Irenaeus refers to the belief of the elders that the peace of the animals would come about with the final coming of Christ. He then takes up the allegorical application of this to men in the Church where peace is already to be found. In both cases therefore the literal interpretation of the passage is to be fulfilled in the new creation, but the parabolic, or allegorical interpretation is already being fulfilled in the Church. There is, therefore, a further hint of the salvation history and progress, not only of man but of the whole creation towards its perfection. It is, then, debatable whether Irenaeus has changed his opinion at all, as is commonly assumed.

33. adv. haer. V xxxii 1; H. ii 413.

spoken of by the prophets were to be taken literally and not interpreted allegorically, 'for all such things as these were unquestionably spoken in reference to the resurrection of the righteous, which takes place after the coming of the Antichrist and the destruction of all the nations under his rule; at that time the righteous shall reign on the earth, growing as a result of the manifestation of the Lord (*crescentes ex apparitione Domini*), and through him they shall become accustomed to grasp the glory of God the Father (*per ipsum assuescent capere gloriam Dei Patris*), and in the kingdom shall enjoy intercourse and communion with the holy angels and union with spiritual beings.' (34)

It is in these two passages in particular that it becomes clear why the millenarianism of Irenaeus is an integral part of the salvation history; it represents the conclusion of the concept of man's growth and development, which all along the Word of God had been fostering. Man cannot finish his growth on earth in this life, and until he has reached perfection, he cannot see God. Therefore, the final stages of growth must take place in some intermediate place, and in that growth the body must share. (35)

34. adv. haer. V xxxv 1; H. ii 423f. 'apparitione'; The Latin text reads: 'visione'. For the emendation see SC 153 ad loc.

35. Here, as both Bengsch and Joppich insist, lies the clue to the fact that the millenarian sections of the adversus haereses are included neither out of some unthinking use of sources, nor even purely for polemical purposes; rather they mark the extension of the line of salvation history from creation to the Incarnation to the Eschaton. See above note 3. As Bengsch says;

Finally, the form of this world will pass away, but not the substance or matter of it, and there will be a new heaven and a new earth which will last for ever, and in it nothing will grow old.⁽³⁶⁾ In it those who are worthy will be placed according to their productivity: those who have produced fruit a hundred-fold will go to heaven; those who have produced fruit sixty-fold will go to Paradise; those who have produced fruit thirty-fold will inhabit the eternal city.⁽³⁷⁾ Then at last the Son, having brought all things to their proper conclusion, will hand over his completed work to the Father.⁽³⁸⁾

So is concluded the work of the Word which began with the creation of man and ends with man finally brought to his true stature, which is to be 'according to the image and likeness of God'.⁽³⁹⁾ The whole long process of

35. (contd.) 'Irenäus war Chiliast, gleichgültig, woher er diese Idee übernommen hat' (op. cit., p. 172). M. O'R. Boyle ('Irenaeus Millennial Hope: A Polemical Weapon', in RTAM 36(1969), pp. 5 - 16) sees the integration of the millennial hope into what Irenaeus says, but still places this rather too heavily on a polemical basis.
36. adv. haer. V xxxvi 1; H. ii 426f.
37. adv. haer. V xxxvi 1f.; H. ii 428.
38. adv. haer. V xxxvi 2; H. ii 429.
39. Cf. 'No theologian had arisen since St Paul and St John who had grasped so much of the purpose of God for his world. "The Making of Man", to borrow Tennyson's great phrase, is his constant theme' (Robinson, op. cit., p. vii). Cf. also what Bruno Reynders calls the 'humanisme' of Irenaeus ('Optimisme et théocentrisme chez saint Irénée', in RTAM 8(1936), pp. 225 - 52).

bringing men to that condition has been the work of the Son of God. From the very moment of man's creation the Word of God had been dealing with man, looking to one end, the perfection of man. The Word had created man, and when man fell the Word did not abandon him but set out to redeem him. The period of the Old Testament paved the way and prepared man for the coming of the Word of God himself who would in the Incarnation manifest the true image and likeness in which man was made and take up again on man's behalf the cause that man had once lost, and make it possible for man to become a son of God by adoption and be made 'according to the image and likeness of God'. In the Church the same Word of God continues to exercise his lordship, leading those who believe in him in the right direction, and at the end giving them the inheritance promised to Abraham the father of their faith. All this is admirably expressed and summed up in the closing lines of the adversus haereses:

And in all these things and through all these things one and the same God the Father is shown, who fashioned man and promised to the fathers the heritage of the earth, who brought it forth in the resurrection of the righteous and fulfilled the promises in the kingdom of his Son; afterwards he provided in a fatherly way things which eye had not seen, nor ear heard and which had not entered man's heart. For there is one Son, who carries out the will of the Father, and one human race in which the mysteries of God are carried out, 'into which things the angels desired to look' (I Pet. 1.12), not being able to search out the Wisdom of God, by which his handiwork

having been conformed to and incorporated with the Son, becomes perfect; that his offspring, the first-begotten Word should descend into what was made (in facturam), that is, into what was fashioned (in plasma), and be grasped by it; and what was made, on the other hand, should grasp the Word and ascend to him, surpassing the angels and becoming 'after the image and likeness of God'. (40)

40. adv. haer. V xxxvi 3; H. ii 429.

*

*

*

*

*

CHAPTER TENTHE REPLY OF IRENAEUS TO THE CHALLENGE OF VALENTINIANISM

We are now in a position to draw together the main features of Irenaeus's reply to the threat posed by Valentinian Gnosticism to the ecclesiastical tradition. In the conclusion to the section on Valentinian Gnosticism we described the threat in the following terms:

The salvation drama presents a coherent and comprehensive scheme in which the central concern is the salvation of man, viewed as the primary point in a movement from ignorance to knowledge, from the primal Father's first self-expression to the accomplishment of the perfection of the spiritual world in the union of the spiritual beings in syzygy. In this movement the central figure is the many-formed Christ. What is demanded of an opponent is that he not only insist on his tradition and attack as many of the individual points of the system as possible, . . . but that he replace the system with something that is equally consistent, equally coherent, equally Christocentric, and with an equal sense of progression towards a desirable goal.⁽¹⁾

From the discussion of the Christocentric salvation history in the previous chapter there can be little doubt that Irenaeus has successfully met the challenge.

One of the remarkable features of Irenaeus's work is its coherence and comprehensiveness, at least when approached from the point of view of salvation history. Even on such matters as the pre-existence of the Son and

1. See above, p. 539.

his relationship to the Father, it is the concept of salvation history that enables us to see these questions in their proper perspective. While there is no question of economic trinitarianism, it is in the activity of God that his trinitarian nature is to be discerned, and the pre-existence of the Son is closely bound up with the idea of one God and his one complete plan from the very beginning of creation to the end of history. Over this the one Christ rules as the one mediator between God and man, and his rule is therefore eternal, over against the temporal duration of the world and its history.

The two concepts which link the two ends of salvation history are, on the one hand, man and his development and, on the other hand, Christ and his creative and redemptive work. All other themes are associated with these. Man, born a child, must grow until he reaches his perfection in being after the image and likeness of God. Already at the outset the two themes are linked, for Christ is the image after which man was made and is being re-made. Herein too lies the necessity for the Incarnation in which the creative and revelatory work of the Word under the old covenant reaches its necessary fulfilment. Once again the speculative problems associated with the Incarnation are treated not for their own sake, but as the fundamental presuppositions of the work of Christ. Christ must be one with those he came to save. This locates the Christology securely within the salvation history. Christ recapitulates the old man whom he had once made and sets him back on the path of

his true growth and pours out the Spirit upon him. The themes of the defeat of Satan and of the undoing of man's disobedience form an integral part of this as well, linking up Redemption with creation and the Fall, and looking forward to the consummation. In the Church the integrated and coherent line continues as Christ leads on his own in history and, through the tradition and the sacraments, fills them with his life, until he brings all things to their completion, having first established his earthly rule (once again, in history). Even the Antichrist has his appointed place within the plan of salvation history.

The salvation history is, above all, Christocentric. Christ is the creator, and is the image after which man is made. Christ prepares for the Incarnation, comes and redeems man and leads him to his perfection. All stages of the salvation history take their significance from Christ and point to him. All this is most sharply focussed in the Incarnation, the turning point of the entire salvation history.⁽²⁾ This is not to say that the Incarnation is redemption, though that is partially true. The Word does not effect redemption just by becoming man; the Word effects redemption as incarnate. As man Christ defeats Satan, as man Christ is obedient even unto death on the cross. Then too, in the on-going salvation history, man must appropriate

2. Cf. 'Die ganze Heilsordnung zielt nicht nur auf Christus hin, sondern sie ist sein Werk. Darum ist die Inkarnation am Ende der Zeiten die Rekapitulation alles Fröhneren' (Bengsch, op. cit., p. 80).

in faith the victory won for him by Christ, and the final goal will not be reached until the consummation.

In all this it is the concept of salvation history that gives coherence and comprehensiveness to the theology of Irenaeus. Salvation history means here both the activity of God in history and the planning of that history. The two themes of salvation history that we isolated in our second chapter are closely integrated in the thought of Irenaeus. Throughout the work of Irenaeus the reader is constantly made aware of the goal towards which the activity of God is directed: that man should be perfected after the image and likeness of God. The theme of man's growth and development is therefore an integral part of salvation history. It is not the only part, but, since the salvation of man is one of Irenaeus's primary concerns, it is an important part of the divine economy. It is this very concern with man that ensures that the divine plan is carried out on the plane of history. For Irenaeus, salvation means the salvation of the whole man and his world, not the salvation of some essential part of man from this world.

It is in this last point that Irenaeus finds the key to his opposition to the Gnostics (and to Marcion for that matter). The comprehensiveness of his scheme of salvation history provides a fitting reply to the salvation drama of Valentinian Gnosticism. Irenaeus's task in the adversus haereses is the exposure and overthrow of the knowledge falsely so-called. This could lead to the supposition that

Irenaeus's task is a purely negative one: an attack on Gnosticism. In fact Irenaeus has a much more positive task in mind: to replace the false knowledge with the true. The positive aspects of Irenaeus's teaching have not escaped the notice of scholars, of course, but it was Brox⁽³⁾ who clearly demonstrated that the positive teaching was not some kind of bonus added by Irenaeus after he had finished his attack on the Gnostics, but an essential part of his polemic. The false knowledge must be countered with the true knowledge. Brox also points out that salvation history is one of the keys to true knowledge.⁽⁴⁾ Salvation history provides the coherent pattern that accounts for the action of the one God in both covenants; salvation history enables Irenaeus to see in the New Testament a new activity of the one God, an activity prepared for by accustoming man to what will come to pass. The *oikonomia* is the whole history of creation and redemption - a plan that can be understood at increasingly deeper levels, but no understanding at all is possible without the one key. Salvation history encompasses recapitulation and the development of man. Salvation is not the only aspect of the true knowledge,⁽⁵⁾ but it is the one that directly concerns us here.

The polemical task of Irenaeus goes far beyond the simple attacking of individual points, though, of course, he does that too.⁽⁶⁾ Rather, Irenaeus's polemic amounts to

3. op. cit., pp. 169 - 99, esp. 180 - 89.

4. Cf. 'Der Fehltritt der Häresie ist es gerade, dass sie Gottes Heilsordnung erkennt' (ibid., p. 181).

5. See Brox, op. cit., pp. 189 - 99.

6. On the technical aspects of Irenaeus's polemic see esp.

going to the heart of the fundamental Gnostic questions about life and its meaning, and answering those questions in a quite different way, and in the answers the significance of the salvation history as a polemical reply to the Gnostic salvation drama emerges with the utmost clarity. The classic form of the Gnostic questions is found in the Excerpta ex Theodoto (78.2): 'It is not the bath (washing) alone that makes us free, but also the knowledge: who were we? what have we become? where were we? into what place have we been cast? whither are we hastening? from what are we delivered? what is birth? what is rebirth?' In Valentinian Gnosticism the salvation drama provides the answers to these questions and enables the individual Gnostic to have a sense of security about his past, his present and his future.⁽⁷⁾

Irenaeus has, in effect, provided a different set of answers to these very questions:⁽⁸⁾ Who were we? We were, maintains Irenaeus, the handiwork of God, fashioned by the Word and the Wisdom of God after the image of God, the Word himself; but we were fashioned in a child-like state and while in that state we were led astray and disobeyed God. What have we become? We have become sons of God by adoption because the same Word of God who fashioned us became man for our sake, and, as man, gained the victory over our old enemy and demonstrated the image and likeness in which we were made, and poured out on us the Spirit that would make us

6. (contd.) B. Reynders, 'La polémique de saint Irénée. Méthode et principes', in RTAM 7(1935), pp. 5 - 27.

7. See above, ch. 8.

8. Cf. 'So wird christlich auf die gnostischen Fragen geantwortet: Woher wir kommen, wer wir sind, wohin wir

truly spiritual through and through. The next three questions: Where were we? into what place have we been cast, whither are we hastening?, are specifically Gnostic ones that presuppose the Gnostic answer, which in turn entails the whole salvation drama. Irenaeus's answer to these questions is set within the framework of his own concept of salvation history, the purposes of God for man in history from creation to consummation, carried out by the Word. We have not been 'cast' anywhere; we have been placed here by God in order that we may grow in the knowledge and love of him, God himself leading us little by little towards our perfection, accustoming us to bear his Spirit, that becoming spiritual through and through we may at length become worthy of attaining to the vision of God himself. The Valentinian salvation drama has been matched by the Christocentric salvation history in Irenaeus. Birth and re-birth refer respectively to our natural birth and to our re-birth through the Spirit poured out by Christ on the man whom he had himself once fashioned.

While the Christocentric salvation history is of considerable polemical importance, it was not a polemical weapon called into existence purely as an answer to the Gnostic threat. The concept of a Christocentric salvation history enabled Irenaeus to meet that threat but he derived the concept itself, at least in part, from his own tradition. The broad sweep of the concept in all its fullness is the

work of Irenaeus himself, perhaps even stimulated by the coherence and comprehensiveness of the Valentinian salvation drama, but both the over-arching framework and many of the individual elements within the concept have histories of their own. Irenaeus did not write in a vacuum; his attack on Gnosticism is mounted from within the ecclesiastical tradition in which he himself stands and which he considers that he is defending.

Bengsch⁽⁹⁾ traces the concept of salvation history back to the New Testament. Bengsch's interest lies in answering the question: was Irenaeus the Biblical theologian he wanted to be? Bengsch discusses the question particularly in relation to John and Paul. So far as Christocentricity is concerned there is a close similarity between Irenaeus and the New Testament which requires no proof. The roots of the divine *οἰκονομία* in the New Testament are not so obvious, however. Ephesians 1.10 may well provide the starting-point, as it does for the concept of recapitulation, but as Bengsch observes, in Ephesians the *οἰκονομία* refers to the end of time, and it is God, not Christ, who recapitulates. Bengsch also points to the significance of the *καιρός* in Paul and John, God's time, which may well have influenced Irenaeus. Paul, John and Irenaeus all see the past, present and future from the stand-point of the fact of Christ. It is also possible, according to Bengsch, that in his polemic Irenaeus has developed both the Johannine insistence on the reality

of the Incarnation and also the strongly Christocentric history of Paul. Irenaeus has not simply adopted these, however; he has welded them together into a single coherent structure in which the Incarnation is an integral part of the divine plan in history. Bengsch is quick to point out that Irenaeus has developed all these ideas well beyond Scripture, and has done so in his own individual way. The *οἰκονομία* and recapitulation are both Christocentric, and Irenaeus has virtually transferred the meaning of *μυστήριον* in Paul to the term *οἰκονομία*. In the field of man's growth and education there is even clearer evidence for Irenaeus's development beyond the New Testament, for, while the starting-point for these ideas may perhaps be found in the ideas of the Law as a school-master (Gal. 4.1 - 3) and in the images of planting and bearing fruit, etc., the scope of Irenaeus's view of man's development is not to be found in the New Testament.

The concept of a Christocentric salvation history may, then, have its roots in the New Testament, but Irenaeus has quite clearly elaborated the idea. Irenaeus was a man of tradition, and within the ecclesiastical tradition as studied in part two of the present work we can trace some of the development of ideas that were eventually taken up by Irenaeus and incorporated into his Christocentric salvation history. The special characteristic of the Christocentric salvation history of Irenaeus is that history itself is raised to the level of a theological principle. The plan of God is worked out by Christ through history so that the

stages of the plan can be traced in a pattern of historical development beginning with Christ's work in creation and ending with the vision of God to which Christ will lead men in the consummation. This conception of a planned development in history is found in the work of only a few of the predecessors of Irenaeus. In several of the other predecessors there is a conception of the activity of God in history, but history itself has not been regarded theologically.

In I Clement the activity of God in the past and in the present is considered, but there is no clear plan of development. There is preparation in the prophets for the Incarnation, and Christ fulfils the promises made to Jacob, but the comparison between past and present is not considered seriously for its significance as a movement of development in God's plan of history. Furthermore, Christ's role is minimal in the history that preceded the Incarnation. Even for the future the concept of progress or movement of development has no significant role in the life of the Church or of man redeemed.

In Ignatius of Antioch there is an obvious plan related to the Incarnation and to the preparation for it, but even so Ignatius wishes to see the Incarnation as a point of discontinuity between the old and the new. Christ has no part in any events prior to the Incarnation. In some respects the ideas expressed in the Epistle to Diognetus are similar to those in Ignatius. History falls into two stages: before and after the Incarnation. History before the

Incarnation is not without meaning, but it is not understood as the gradual unfolding of a plan culminating in the Incarnation. In contrast to the situation in Ignatius, in the Epistle to Diognetus Christ is active in creation. The period of history after the Incarnation is not seen as progressing towards the consummation; rather the two comings of Christ are simply contrasted.

There is an awareness of the movement of events in the Epistula Apostolorum and in the theme of the true prophet in the Pseudo-Clementine writings, but in the Epistula Apostolorum the movement itself is incidental and not the result of a consciously pursued plan, and the movement in the theme of the true prophet is unconnected with the movement of history as such. Salvation history does appear in the Pseudo-Clementine writings in the section Rec. I 27 - 43, but there its dominant theme is the removal of the Jewish sacrifices, and Christology is quite insignificant.

Christocentricity is an obvious feature of both the Shepherd of Hermas and the Ascension of Isaiah, and, in the latter, there is a Christocentric plan that has some affinities with the salvation drama of Valentinian Gnosticism. History, however, as a planned movement is of no importance in either work. The same is also true of the ad Autolycum of Theophilus of Antioch. In Theophilus we meet quite a number of ideas that are taken up by Irenaeus, but the most important theme from the point of view of salvation history, the development of man, has no relationship to history, and when Theophilus does consider history it is purely as chronology and not as the recital of God's

acts in history.

In Justin Martyr we again find numerous themes that are taken up by Irenaeus. With regard to a Christocentric salvation history we observed the Christocentricity of Justin's thought; Christ is active in creation, in the theophanies in the Old Testament, in the prophets, the Incarnation and the consummation. As the Logos his role is as wide as mankind itself. Justin is fully aware of the acts of God in the history of Israel and of the shift of Israel to the Church. The Incarnation takes place in history, and Justin acknowledges the tension of the last days in which he lives. Yet we rejected the idea of a fully developed Christocentric salvation history in Justin, for we could not find sufficient evidence that Justin himself had created such a synthesis as that would have demanded. In addition, unlike Irenaeus, Justin has made little effort consciously to link redemption with man's past history, nor is there any suggestion of man's development in Justin's theology.

In the three remaining works, the Epistle of Barnabas, the Acts of Paul and the Paschal Homily of Melito of Sardis, we can discern the outlines of Christocentric salvation history. In the Epistle of Barnabas there is a well-defined Christocentric salvation history in the sense that Christ has a role at each stage of history, and

especially, of course, at the Incarnation. A clear link is developed by the author between the original creation and re-creation, and salvation history is considered in both positive and negative aspects: positive in the line

from creation through the prophets, the Incarnation and the Church to the consummation; negative in Israel's failure culminating in the crucifixion of Jesus as the sign of complete apostasy. However, the concept of a plan is not given any serious elaboration. In the Acts of Paul, notably in III Corinthians, there is a sketch of the history of Israel leading to the history of the Church, and, more important, there is the idea of man's movement towards sonship, a movement in which the Incarnation has a crucial role. While this does not add up to a fully-developed Christocentric salvation history, it is interesting that these concepts should find expression in a work of anti-Gnostic polemic. In other words, Irenaeus in his own much more developed way has made use of a weapon against the Gnostics that has also been used by the author of III Corinthians.

It is in Melito of Sardis that we find the most fully-developed Christocentric salvation history outside Irenaeus. There is a clear Christocentric plan from creation to consummation, in which the Incarnation is the turning point. The history of Israel is a preparation in the form of a model for the coming of Christ, and in his Incarnation Christ undoes the effects of suffering and death that resulted from the Fall. This too, is prepared for by the sufferings of the patriarchs and prophets. The Christology of Melito is an integral part of this salvation history, for Christ shares the sufferings of man as man and as God triumphs over them. The whole plan looks to its fulfilment

in the consummation. Complete as this is, it is not as fully comprehensive as the form it takes in Irenaeus. Most noticeably it lacks the theme of man's growth and development.

It is with Irenaeus, therefore, that the concept of a Christocentric salvation history emerges both as a means of welding together the disparate elements of the ecclesiastical tradition and as a polemical weapon against Gnosticism. The synthesis and the polemic are themselves inextricably interwoven, because it is precisely as a synthesis of the ecclesiastical tradition that the Christocentric salvation history furnishes Irenaeus with such a formidable weapon against the Gnostics.⁽¹⁰⁾ In the materials gathered from his tradition, developed from a number of different sources and woven together into a coherent and comprehensive historical drama, Irenaeus finds an adequate reply to the coherent and comprehensive drama of Valentinian Gnosticism.

We began our study with two problems: the polemical task of Irenaeus and his use of sources. The solution of these two problems lies in the appreciation of two keys to the thought of Irenaeus: the polemical task itself and the centre of gravity of Irenaeus's theology, which is the Christocentric salvation history, and the further realisation that the Christocentric salvation history is itself the most significant polemical weapon. In the light of this, the question of sources assumes its correct proportions, and the purpose of any borrowing becomes clear.

10. In a not dissimilar way Daniélou shows how the

From his predecessors Irenaeus adopted many of the details of the salvation history, but on it all he set the seal of his own vision. In this our present study reinforces what has already been pointed out by other scholars.⁽¹¹⁾ We can go further than that, however, for the present study establishes even more firmly the conclusions especially of Brox and Bengsch about the way in which Irenaeus's own theological affirmations provide the sufficient answers to the challenge of Valentinian Gnosticism. When all this is then set against the wider context of the whole Christian development of the second century something of the stature of Irenaeus as a theologian can be seen. In the first place Irenaeus emerges as one who met adequately the threat of Valentinian Gnosticism by his unified and unifying concept of salvation history. Secondly, it is clear that, in answering the Gnostic challenge, Irenaeus brought to a synthesis many of the currents of the ecclesiastical tradition before him. Thirdly, while it is not true to say

10. (contd.) attitude of Irenaeus to the unity of the Old and New Testaments emerges from his opposition to the Gnostics. In the tradition before Irenaeus two different attitudes to the Old Testament can be discerned: some writers insisted on the newness of the New Testament in opposition to a Jewish Christian tendency to reduce the element of novelty; other writers tended to over-emphasise the New Testament and virtually discard the Old. To the first group belong the author of the Epistle of Barnabas and Justin Martyr, at least in his Dialogue, and to the second group belong the Gnostics and especially Marcion. By successfully uniting the Old and New Testaments without undermining the uniqueness of the New Testament Irenaeus both answers the Gnostics and Marcion and lays the

that orthodoxy and heresy were as sharply defined in Irenaeus's day as has sometimes been thought in the past (even by Irenaeus himself), there is no doubt that in the defence of his tradition Irenaeus hastened the polarisation of the Christian tradition into orthodoxy and heresy. Finally, in bringing about that polarisation, Irenaeus set on a firmer footing the criteria by which orthodoxy and heresy were to be distinguished, most notably by the Rule of Faith and the apostolic tradition, of both of which one of the hallmarks, at least in the thinking of Irenaeus, was the Christocentric salvation history.

10. (contd.) foundations of a theology of history. J.

Daniélou, 'Saint Irénée et les origines de la théologie de l'histoire', in RSR 34(1947), pp. 227 - 31.

11. See above, esp. ch. 1.

* * * * *

APPENDIX

A NOTE ON THE TEXTS OF THE WORKS BY IRENAEUS.

A. ADVERSUS HAERESSES

The work is extant in its entirety only in a generally reliable Latin translation. On the date of the Latin translation see the relevant articles in W. Sanday and C.H. Turner, Novum Testamentum Sancti Irenaei episcopi Lugdunensis (Old-Latin Biblical Texts: No VII, Oxford, 1923), and Sven Lundstrom, Studien zur lateinischen Irenausubersetzung (Lund, 1943), esp. pp. 90 - 109. The terminus ad quem of the Latin translation is 422 since it was used then by Augustine. On the reliability of the translation see especially the relevant chapters of the introductory volumes of Books IV and V of the edition of Irenaeus in the series Sources chrétiennes (Book IV, vol. 1 = SC 100 (1), pp. 105 - 85, esp. pp. 110 - 29; Book V, vol. 1 = SC 152, pp. 27 - 63). The remarks are directed to the specific books under discussion, but the general conclusions on the Latin translation will undoubtedly apply to the translation as a whole. It is habitually faithful and often very literal, though there are some approximate translations, a tendency to verbosity, some errors and omissions, and unfortunately, some deliberate alterations (see A. Rousseau, SC 100 (1), pp. 128f.). This judgement is based on a comparison of the Latin and the even more slavish Armenian translation and the Greek citations of Book IV.

Apart from the Latin, there are an Armenian version of Books IV and V, made about the end of the 6th Cent., and various citations in Greek, Syriac, Armenian, Ethiopic, Arabic and Slavic; there are also two papyrus fragments of the original Greek.

For the present study the following editions were used: W.W. Harvey, Sancti Irenaei episcopi Lugdunensis Libri quinque adversus haereses (2 vols., Cambridge, 1857). A. Stieren, Sancti Irenaei episcopi Lugdunensis quae

supersunt omnia (2 vols., Leipzig, 1853).

R. Massuet, Sancti Irenaei episcopi Lugdunensis et martyris, detectionis et eversionis falso cognominate agnitionis, seu contra haereses libri quinque (Paris, 1710; reprinted by Migne in Patrologia Graeca, vol. VII, 1857).

F. Sagnard, Irénee de Lyon. Contre les Hérésies. Mise en lumière et Réfutation de la prétendue 'connaissance', Book III (Paris, 1952; = SC 34).

A. Rousseau, et al., Irénee de Lyon. Contre les hérésies, Book IV (2 vols., Paris, 1965; = SC 100 (1) and (2)).

A. Rousseau, L. Doutreleau and C. Mercier, Irénee de Lyon. Contre les Hérésies, Book V, (2 vols., Paris, 1969; = SC 152, 153).

The Greek citations of the adversus haereses stem from five main sources; the Panarion of Epiphanius, the Refutatio of Hippolytus, the Historia Ecclesiastica of Eusebius, the Sacra Parallela of John of Damascus and the Eranistes of Theodoret. In the edition for the series Sources chrétiennes the Armenian version is also taken into account. Greek fragments of Irenaeus, discovered since the editions of Harvey and Massuet, including the fragments of the Jena Papyrus and the Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 405, are printed in Bruno Reynders' Lexique comparé, pp. 31 - 37. Reynders also gives full references to the editions of the works of the writers from which the citations come (op. cit., pp. 16 - 30), and a concordance of the several editions of Irenaeus prior to the Sources Chrétiennes project. Further discussion of the Jena Papyrus is to be found in the SC edition of Book V (pp. 119 - 57 of vol. 1 = SC 152; the text as edited by A. Rousseau is printed on pp. 355 - 77 of the same volume). Where the Greek citations of Irenaeus are used the author in whom it is preserved is indicated.

References to the adversus haereses are as follows: to the book, chapter and paragraph of the division of Massuet (followed by Stieren) and to the volume and page number of Harvey.

B. DEMONSTRATIO.

The Armenian version of this work was made about the end of the sixth century, direct from the Greek. 'The version clearly belongs to a class of servile renderings of Greek texts, so closely modelled on the Greek as to justify the conjecture that they were intended rather as "keys" to the original text than as "translations" in the normal sense' (J.P. Smith, op. cit., p. 121).

For the present work the translation used is that of J.P. Smith, (op. cit.), though occasionally the preference of one of the other editors has been followed. Constant reference has also been made to L.M. Froidevaux, Irénée de Lyon. Démonstration de la prédication apostolique, (Paris, 1959; = SC 62) and J.A. Robinson, St Irenaeus. The Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching (London, 1920). The following have also been consulted: St. Irenaeus, The Proof of the Apostolic Preaching with seven fragments. Armenian Version edited and translated by Karapet Ter Mekerttschian and S.G. Wilson (Paris, 1919; = Patrologia Orientalis, XII/5); S. Irénée. Démonstration de la prédication apostolique, translated from the Armenian and annotated by J. Barthoulot, with an introduction and notes by J. Tixeront, (RSR 6(1916), pp. 361 - 432; reprinted with the previous version in PO, XII/5); Des heiligen Irenaeus Schrift zum Erweis der apostolischen Verkündigung, from the Armenian by S. Weber (Munich, 1912; = Bibliothek der Kirchenväter, IV/2); Des heiligen Irenäus Schrift zum Erweise der apostolischen Verkündigung, edited and translated by K. Ter Mekerttschian and E. Ter Minassiantz, with an addendum and notes by A. Harnack (Leipzig, 1907; = TU 31).

ABBREVIATIONS

<u>ACW</u>	<u>Ancient Christian Writers</u>
<u>ANCL</u>	<u>Ante-Nicene Christian Library</u>
<u>CQR</u>	<u>Church Quarterly Review</u>
<u>DTC</u>	<u>Dictionnaire de théologie catholique</u>
<u>ET</u>	<u>English Translation</u>
<u>ExpT</u>	<u>Expository Times</u>
<u>FRLANT</u>	<u>Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments</u>
<u>GCS</u>	<u>Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte</u>
<u>HThR</u>	<u>Harvard Theological Review</u>
<u>JBL</u>	<u>Journal of Biblical Literature</u>
<u>JEH</u>	<u>Journal of Ecclesiastical History</u>
<u>JR</u>	<u>Journal of Religion</u>
<u>JTS</u>	<u>Journal of Theological Studies</u>
<u>NRTh</u>	<u>Nouvelle Revue théologique</u>
<u>NT</u>	<u>Novum Testamentum</u>
<u>NTA</u> I, - II	<u>New Testament Apocrypha, vol. I, - II (see Bibliography, section 2, Hennecke)</u>
<u>NTS</u>	<u>New Testament Studies</u>
<u>NTT</u>	<u>Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift</u>
<u>OECT</u>	<u>Oxford Early Christian Texts</u>
<u>OLZ</u>	<u>Orientalistische Literaturzeitung</u>
<u>Origini</u>	<u>Le Origini dello Gnosticismo (see Bibliography, section 3, Bianchi)</u>
<u>PO</u>	<u>Patrologia Orientalis</u>
<u>RB</u>	<u>Revue Biblique</u>
<u>RevSR</u>	<u>Revue des sciences religieuses</u>
<u>RevThPh</u>	<u>Revue de théologie et de philosophie</u>
<u>RHE</u>	<u>Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique</u>
<u>RMM</u>	<u>Revue de métaphysique et de morale</u>
<u>RSR</u>	<u>Recherches de science religieuse</u>
<u>RTAM</u>	<u>Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale</u>
<u>SBT</u>	<u>Studies in Biblical Theology</u>
<u>SC</u>	<u>Sources chrétiennes</u>

<u>ScJTh</u>	<u>Scottish Journal of Theology</u>
<u>SMR</u>	<u>Studia Montis Regii</u>
<u>StTh</u>	<u>Studia Theologica</u>
<u>ThPh</u>	<u>Theologie und Philosophie</u>
<u>ThR</u>	<u>Theologische Rundschau</u>
<u>TLZ</u>	<u>Theologische Literaturzeitung</u>
<u>TQ</u>	<u>Theologische Quartalschrift</u>
<u>TU</u>	<u>Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur</u>
<u>TWNT</u>	<u>Theologische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament</u>
<u>VC</u>	<u>Vigiliae Christianae</u>
<u>ZkathTh</u>	<u>Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie</u>
<u>ZKG</u>	<u>Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte</u>
<u>ZNTW</u>	<u>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissen- schaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</u>
<u>ZRGG</u>	<u>Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgesch- ichte</u>
<u>ZSTh</u>	<u>Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie</u>
<u>ZThK</u>	<u>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</u>

A SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

I THE CHURCH FATHERS; II Gnostic AND APOCRYPHAL LITERATURE;
III BOOKS; IV ARTICLES.

I THE CHURCH FATHERS

Apostolic Fathers:

- J.B. Lightfoot, The Apostolic Fathers, revised texts, edited and completed by J.R. Harmer (London, 1898).
- J.B. Lightfoot, The Apostolic Fathers. Part 1, S. Clement of Rome. A Revised Text (2 vols.); Part 2, S. Ignatius, S. Polycarp. Revised Texts (2 vols.) (London, 1885, 1890).
- R.M. Grant (ed.), The Apostolic Fathers. A New Translation and Commentary, 6 vols. (New York, Camden, 1964 - 68).

Aristides:

- J. Geffcken, Zwei griechische Apologeten (Leipzig & Berlin, 1907; = Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Kommentare zu griechischen und römischen Schriftstellern), pp. 1 - 96.
- J.R. Harris (ed.), The Apology of Aristides on behalf of the Christians from a Syriac Ms. preserved on Mount Sinai, with an appendix containing the Main Portion of the Original Greek Text by J.A. Robinson (Cambridge, 1891; = Texts and Studies I/1).
- E. Hennecke, Die Apologie des Aristides. Recension und Rekonstruktion des Textes (Leipzig, 1893; = TU IV/3).
- D.M. Kay (tr.), The Apology of Aristides the Philosopher (Edinburgh, 1897; = ANCL add. vol., pp. 257 - 79).

Athenagoras:

J. Geffcken, Zwei griechische Apologeten (Leipzig & Berlin, 1907; = Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Kommentare zu griechischen und römischen Schriftstellern), pp. 115 - 238.

W.R. Schoedel (ed.), Athenagoras: Legatio and De Resurrectione (Oxford, 1972; = OECT).

E. Schwartz (ed.), Athenagorae libellus pro Christianis. Oratio de resurrectione cadaverum (Leipzig, 1891; = TU IV/2).

Clement of Alexandria: Excerpta ex Theodoto:

R.P. Casey (ed.), The Excerpta ex Theodoto of Clement of Alexandria (London, 1934; = Studies and Documents I).

F. Sagnard (ed.), Extraits de Théodote (Paris, 1948; = SC 23).

Epistle to Diognetus:

H.I. Marrou (ed.), A Diognète (Paris, 1951; = SC 33).

H.G. Meecham (ed.), The Epistle to Diognetus (Manchester, 1949; = Publications of the University of Manchester CCCV, Theological Series VII).

Irenaeus: adversus haereses:

J.E. Grabe (ed.), S. Irenaei episcopi lugdunensis Contra omnes Haereses Libri Quinque (London, 1722).

W.W. Harvey (ed.), Sancti Irenaei episcopi Lugdunensis Libri quinque adversus haereses, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1857).

R. Massuet (ed.), Sancti Irenaei episcopi Lugdunensis et martyris, detectionis et ever-
sionis falso cognominate agnitionis,
seu contra haereses libri quinque
(Paris, 1710; r.p. by Migne, Patrologia Graeca, vol. 7, 1857).

- A. Stieren (ed.), Sancti Irenaei episcopi Lugdunensis quae supersunt omnia, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1853).
- F. Sagnard (ed.), Irénée de Lyon. Contre les hérésies. Mise en lumière et réfutation de la prétendue "connaissance". Livre III (Paris, 1952; = SC 34).
- A. Rousseau (ed.), Irénée de Lyon. Contre les hérésies. Livre IV, 2 vols. (Paris, 1965; = SC 100 (1) & (2)).
- A. Rousseau, L. Doutreleau, C. Mercier (edd.), Irénée de Lyon. Contre les hérésies. Livre V, 2 vols. (Paris, 1969; = SC 152, 153).
- A. Roberts, W.H. Rambaut (trs.), The Writings of Irenaeus, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1868; = ANCL 5, 9).

Irenaeus: Demonstratio:

- J. Barthoulot, S. Irénée. Démonstration de la prédication apostolique, with introduction and notes by J. Tixeront, in RSR 6(1916), pp. 361 - 432; r.p. in PO XII/5 (Paris, 1919).
- L.M. Froidevaux, Irénée de Lyon. Démonstration de la prédication apostolique (Paris, 1959; = SC 62).
- K. Ter Mekerttschian, E. Ter Minassiantz (edd.), Des hl. Irenäus Schrift zum Erweise der apostolischen Verkündigung, mit einem Nachwort und Anmerkungen von A. Harnack (Leipzig, 1907; = TU 31/1).
- K. Ter Mekerttschian, S.G. Wilson (edd.), S. Irenaeus. The Proof of the Apostolic Preaching, with seven fragments (Paris, 1919; = PO XII/5).

- J.A. Robinson, St. Irenaeus, The Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching (London, 1920.)
- J.P. Smith, St. Irenaeus Proof of the Apostolic Preaching (London, 1952; = ACW 16).
- S. Weber, Des hl. Irenaeus Schrift zum Erweis der apostolischen Verkündigung (Munich, 1912; = Bibliothek der Kirchenväter 4).

Justin Martyr:

- J.C.T. Otto (ed.), S. Justini philosophi et martyris opera quae feruntur omnia, 3 vols. (2nd ed., Jena, 1847 - 49).
- M. Dods, G. Reith, B.P. Pratten (trs.), Writings of Justin Martyr (Edinburgh, 1867; = ANCL 2).

Melito of Sardis:

- C. Bonner (ed.), The Homily on the Passion by Melito Bishop of Sardis with some Fragments of the Apocryphal Ezekiel (London, 1940; = Studies and Documents 12).
- O. Perler (ed.), Méliton de Sardes, Sur la Pâque et fragments (Paris, 1966; = SC 123).

Tatian:

- E. Schwartz (ed.), Tatiani Oratio ad Graecos (Leipzig, 1888; = TU IV/1).
- B.P. Pratten (tr.) Tatian's Address to the Greeks (Edinburgh, 1867; = ANCL 3).

Theophilus of Antioch:

- G. Bardy (ed.), Théophile d'Antioche, Trois Livres à Autolyceus (Paris, 1948; = SC 20).
- R.M. Grant (ed.), Theophilus of Antioch ad Autolyceum (Oxford, 1970; = OECT).

II GNOSTIC AND APOCRYPHAL LITERATURE

Collections:

- W. Foerster (ed.), Gnosis. A Selection of Gnostic Texts, Vol. 1. Patristic Evidence, ET ed. R. McL. Wilson (Oxford, 1972).
- R.M. Grant (ed.), Gnosticism. An Anthology (London, 1961).
- R. Haardt, Gnosis: Character and Testimony, ET (Leiden, 1971).
- E. Hennecke, New Testament Apocrypha, ed. W. Schneemelcher, ET ed. R. McL. Wilson, 2 vols. (London, 1963, 65).
- A. Hilgenfeld, Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristenthums, urkundlich dargestellt (Leipzig, 1884).

Acts of Paul:

- C. Schmidt (ed.), Acta Pauli aus der heidelberger koptischen Papyrushandschrift Nr. 1 (2nd ed., Leipzig, 1905).
- C. Schmidt (ed.), ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΠΑΥΛΟΥ, Acta Pauli nach dem Papyrus der Hamburger Staats- und Universitäts-Bibliothek (Hamburg, 1936; = Veröffentlichungen aus der Hamburger Staats- und Universitäts-Bibliothek, N.F. vol. 2).
- M. Testuz (ed.), Papyrus Bodmer X - XII: X: Correspondance apocryphe des Corinthiens et de l'apôtre Paul; XI: Onzième Ode de Salomon; XII: Fragment d'un Hymne liturgique. Manuscrit du IIIe siècle (Geneva, 1959).

Apocryphon of James:

- M. Malinine, H. -C. Puech, G. Quispel, W. Till, R. Kasser (edd.), Epistula Jacobi Apocrypha. Codex Jung F. I^r - F. VII^{IV} (pp. 1 - 16) (Zürich & Stuttgart, 1968).

H.M. Schenke, 'Der Jacobusbrief aus dem Codex Jung',
in OLZ 66(1971), cols. 117 - 30.

Apocryphon of John:

S. Giversen (ed.), Apocryphon Johannis. The Coptic Text of the Apocryphon Johannis in the Nag Hammadi Codex II (Copenhagen, 1963).

M. Krause, P. Labib (edd.), Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo (Wiesbaden, 1962; = Abhandlungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo).

W.C. Till (ed.), Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502 (Berlin, 1955; = TU 60).

Ascension of Isaiah:

R.H. Charles, The Ascension of Isaiah (London, 1919; = Translations of Early Documents, Series I).

Clement of Alexandria: Pseudo-Clementine Writings:

B. Rehm (ed.), Die Pseudoklementinen. I, Homilien, II, Rekognitionen in Rufins Übersetzung (Berlin, 1953, 1965; = GCS 42, 51).

T. Smith, et al. (trs.), The Clementine Recognitions, The Clementine Homilies (Edinburgh, 1867, 1870; = ANCL 3, 17).

Epistula Apostolorum:

L. Guerrier (ed.), Le Testament en Galilée de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ (Paris, 1913; = PO IX/3).

C. Schmidt (ed.), Gespräche Jesu mit seinen Jüngern nach der Auferstehung. Ein katholisch-apostolisches Sendschreiben des 2. Jahrhunderts (Leipzig, 1919; = TU 43).

Gospel of Philip:

C.J. de Catanzaro, 'The Gospel according to Philip', in JTS n.s. 13(1962), pp. 35 - 71.

- Y. Janssens, 'L'Évangile selon Philippe', in Le Muséon 81(1968), pp. 79 - 133.
- R. Kasser, 'Bibliothèque Gnostique VIII: L'Évangile selon Philippe', in RevThPh 20(1970), pp. 12 - 35.
- J.E. Ménard (ed.), L'Évangile selon Philippe (Paris, 1967).
- H.M. Schenke, 'Das Evangelium nach Philippus. Ein Evangelium der Valentinianer aus dem Funde von Nag-Hamadi', in TLZ 84(1959), cols. 1 - 26.
- R.McL. Wilson, The Gospel of Philip (London, 1962).
- Gospel of Thomas:
- A. Guillaumont, H.-C. Puech, G. Quispel, W. Till, Yassah 'Abd al Masih (edd.), The Gospel according to Thomas (Leiden & London, 1959).
- R.M. Grant, with D.N. Freedman, The Secret Sayings of Jesus: with an English translation of the Gospel of Thomas by W.R. Schoedel (London, 1960).
- Gospel of Truth:
- K. Grobel, The Gospel of Truth: A Valentinian Meditation on the Gospel (London, 1960).
- W.C. Till 'Das Evangelium der Wahrheit. Neue Übersetzung des vollständigen Textes', in ZNTW 50(1959), pp. 165 - 85.
- M. Malinine, H.C. Puech, G. Quispel (edd.), Evangelium Veritatis. Codex Jung f. VIII^v - XVI^v (p. 16 - 32)/ f. XIX^r - XXII^r (p. 37 - 43) (Zürich, 1956; = Studien aus dem C.G. Jung-Institut 6).
- M. Malinine, H.C. Puech, G. Quispel, W. Till (edd.), Evangelium Veritatis Supplementum. Codex Jung F. XVII^r - F. XVIII^v (p. 33 - 36) (Zürich & Stuttgart, 1961;

= Studien aus dem C.G. Jung-Institut Zürich 6).

J.E. Ménard, L'Évangile de Vérité: Rétroversion grecque et commentaire (Paris, 1962).

J.E. Ménard, L'Évangile de Vérité (Leiden, 1972; = Nag Hammadi Studies II).

Heracleon:

A.E. Brooke (ed.), The Fragments of Heracleon (Cambridge, 1891; = Texts and Studies I/4).

Y. Janssens, 'Heracléon. Commentaire sur l'évangile selon saint Jean', in Le Muséon 72 (1959), pp. 101 - 51, 277 - 99.

Ptolemaeus:

G. Quispel (ed.), Ptolémée. Lettre à Flora (Paris, 1949; = SC 24).

De Resurrectione:

M. Malinine, H.C. Puech, G. Quispel, W. Till (edd.), De Resurrectione (Epistula ad Rheginum) Codex Jung F. XXII^r - F. XXV^v (pp. 43 - 50) (Zürich & Stuttgart, 1963).

M.L. Peel, The Epistle to Rheginos. A Valentinian Letter on the Resurrection (London, 1969).

Sibylline Oracles:

J. Geffcken (ed.), Die Oracula Sibyllina (Leipzig, 1902; = GCS 8).

Tractatus Tripartitus:

R. Kasser, M. Malinine, H.C. Puech, G. Quispel, J. Zandee (edd.), Tractatus Tripartitus, Pars I, De Supernis. Codex Jung F. XXVI^r - F. LII^v (p. 51 - 104) (Bern, 1973).

III BOOKS

E. Aleith, Paulusverständnis in der alten Kirche (Berlin, 1937; = Beiheft zur ZNTW 18).

- C. Andresen, Logos und Nomos. Die Polemik des Kelsos wider das Christentum (Berlin, 1955; = Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 30).
- S. Arai, Die Christologie des Evangelium Veritatis. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung (Leiden, 1964).
- G.T. Armstrong, Die Genesis in der Alten Kirche. Die drei Kirchenväter (Tübingen, 1962; = Beiträge zur Geschichte der Biblischen Hermeneutik 4).
- J. Barbel, Christos Angelos. Die Anschauung von Christus als Bote und Engel in der gelehrten und volkstümlichen Literatur des christlichen Altertums. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Ursprungs und der Fortdauer des Arianismus (Bonn, 1941; = Theophaneia 3).
- L.W. Barnard, Justin Martyr His Life and Thought (Cambridge, 1967).
- _____, Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and their Background (Oxford, 1966).
- C. Barth, Die Interpretation des Neuen Testaments in der valentinianischen Gnosis (Leipzig, 1911; = TU 37/3).
- H.W. Bartsch, Gnostisches Gut und Gemeindetradition bei Ignatius von Antiochien (Gütersloh, 1940; = Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie II/44).
- W. Bauer, Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity, ET ed. R.A. Kraft & G. Krodel (Philadelphia, 1971).
- A. Bengsch, Heilsgeschichte und Heilswissen. Eine Untersuchung zur Struktur und Entfaltung des theologischen Denkens im Werk "Adversus Haereses" des hl. Irenäus von Lyon (Leipzig, 1957; = Erfurter theologische Studien 3).

- A. Benoit, Saint Irénée. Introduction à l'étude de sa théologie (Paris, 1960).
- H. Berkhof, The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit (London, 1965; = The Annie Kinhead Warfield Lectures, 1963 - 1964).
- P. Beskow, Rex Glorïae. The Kingship of Christ in the Early Church (Uppsala, 1962).
- P. Beuzart, Essai sur la théologie d'Irénée (Le Puy-en-Velay, 1908).
- U. Bianchi (ed.), Le Origini dello Gnosticismo: Colloquio di Messina 13 - 18 Aprile 1966; Testi e discussioni (Leiden, 1967; = Studies in the History of Religions (Supplements to Numen) 12).
- W. Bieder, Die Vorstellung von der Höllenfahrt Jesu Christi. Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Vorstellung vom sog. Descensus ad inferos (Zürich, 1949; = Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments 19).
- C. Bigg, The Christian Platonists of Alexandria (2nd ed., Oxford, 1913; = The Bampton Lectures of 1886).
- G.N. Bonwetsch, Die Theologie des Irenäus (Gütersloh, 1925; = Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie II/9).
- W. Bousset, Jüdisch-Christlicher Schulbetrieb in Alexandria und Rom. Literarische Untersuchungen zu Philo und Clemens von Alexandria Justin und Irenäus (Göttingen, 1915; = FRLANT 23).
- N. Brox, Offenbarung, Gnosis und gnostischer Mythos bei Irenäus von Lyon. Zur Charakteristik der Systeme (Salzburg & Munich, 1966; = Salzburger Patristische Studien 1).

- R. Bultmann, Primitive Christianity in its Contemporary Setting, ET (London, 1960).
- F.C. Burkitt, Church and Gnosis. A Study of Christian Thought and Speculation in the Second Century (Cambridge, 1932; = The Morse Lectures for 1931).
- C. Colpe, Die religionsgeschichtliche Schule. Darstellung und Kritik ihres Bildes vom gnostischen Erlösermythus (Göttingen, 1961; = FRLANT 78).
- Y.M.-J. Congar, Tradition and Traditions. An historical and a theological essay, ET (London, 1966).
- V. Corwin, St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch (New Haven, 1960; = Yale Publications in Religion 1).
- L. Cristiani, Saint Irénée, Evêque de Lyon, Martyr (Paris, 1927).
- F.L. Cross, The Early Christian Fathers (London, 1960).
- O. Cullmann, Christ and Time. The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History, ET (rev. ed., London, 1962).
- _____, Salvation in History, ET (London, 1967).
- J. Daniélou, The Development of Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea. I. The Theology of Jewish Christianity, ET (London, 1964).
- L. Deiss, Printemps de la théologie. Apologues grecs du IIe siècle. Irénée de Lyons (Paris, 1965; = Vivante tradition 4).
- C.H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures. The Sub-structure of New Testament Theology (London, 1965).

- J. Doresse, The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics. An Introduction to the Gnostic Coptic manuscripts discovered at Chenoboskion, ET (London, 1960).
- L. Duncker, Des heiligen Irenäus Christologie in Zusammenhange mit dessen theologischen und anthropologischen Grundlehren (Göttingen, 1843).
- M. Elze, Tatian und seine Theologie (Göttingen, 1959; = Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte 9).
- E. de Faye, Gnostiques et Gnosticisme. Étude critique des documents du Gnosticisme Chrétien aux IIe et IIIe siècles (2nd ed., Paris, 1925).
- A.L. Feder, Justins des Märtyrers Lehre von Jesus Christus, dem Messias und dem menschgewordenen Sohne Gottes. Eine dogmengeschichtliche Monographie (Freiburg i.B., 1906).
- W. Foerster, Von Valentin zu Herakleon. Untersuchungen über die Quellen und die Entwicklung der valentinianischen Gnosis (Giessen, 1928; = Beiheft zur ZNTW 7).
- B.E. Gärtner, The Theology of the Gospel of Thomas, ET (London, 1961).
- J. Geffcken, Komposition und Entstehungszeit der Oracula Sibyllina (Leipzig, 1902; = TU 23/1).
- S. Giet, Hermas et les Pasteurs. Les trois auteurs du Pasteur d'Hermas (Paris, 1963).
- E.R. Goodenough, The Theology of Justin Martyr. An Investigation into the Conceptions of Early Christian Literature and its Hellenistic and Judaistic Influences (r.p. Amsterdam, 1968).

- E.J. Goodspeed, Index Apologeticus sive Clavis Iustini martyris operum aliorumque apologetarum pristinorum (Leipzig, 1912).
- L. Goppelt, Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times, ET (London, 1970).
- R.M. Grant, After the New Testament (Philadelphia, 1967).
- _____, Gnosticism and Early Christianity (rev. ed., New York, 1966).
- A. Grillmeier, Christ in Christian Tradition. From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451), ET (London, 1965).
- E. Haenchen, Die Botschaft des Thomas-Evangeliums (Berlin, 1961; = Theologische Bibliothek Töpelmann 6).
- R.P.C. Hanson, Tradition in the Early Church (London, 1962).
- A. Harnack, History of Dogma, ET, 7 vols. (London, 1894 - 99).
- J.R. Harris, Testimonies, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1916, 1920).
- H. Hegermann, Die Vorstellung vom Schöpfungsmittler im hellenistischen Judentum und Urchristentum (Berlin, 1961; = TU 82).
- G. Heinrici, Die Valentinianische Gnosis und die heilige Schrift (Berlin, 1871).
- F.R.M. Hitchcock, Irenaeus of Lugdunum. A Study of his Teaching (Cambridge, 1914).
- J. Hoh, Die Lehre des hl. Irenäus über das Neue Testament (Münster i.W., 1919; = Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen VII 4,5).
- M. Hornschuh, Studien zur Epistula Apostolorum (Berlin, 1965; = Patristische Texte und Studien 5).
- A. Houssiau, La Christologie de saint Irénée (Louvain, 1955).

- H. Jonas, Gnosis und spätantiker Geist, 2 vols. (Teil I, 3rd ed. Teil II/erste Hälfte, 2nd ed., Göttingen, 1964, 1966; = FRLANT 51, 63).
- _____, The Gnostic Religion. The Message of the Alien God and the Beginnings of Christianity (2nd ed., Boston, 1963).
- G. Joppich, Salus Carnis. Eine Untersuchung in der Theologie des hl. Irenäus von Lyon (Münsterschwarzach, 1965; = Münsterschwarzacher Studien 1).
- J.N.D. Kelly, Early Christian Creeds (2nd ed., London, 1960).
- _____, Early Christian Doctrines (4th ed., London, 1968).
- G. Kretschmar, Studien zur frühchristlichen Trinitätstheologie (Tübingen, 1956; = Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 21).
- S. Laeuchli, The Language of Faith. An Introduction to the Semantic Dilemma of the Early Church (London, 1965).
- G.W.H. Lampe, The Seal of the Spirit. A Study in the Doctrine of Baptism and Confirmation in the New Testament and the Fathers (2nd ed., London, 1967).
- J. Lawson, The Biblical Theology of Saint Irenaeus (London, 1948).
- _____, A Theological and Historical Introduction to the Apostolic Fathers (New York, 1961).
- J. Lebreton, Histoire du Dogme de la Trinité dès origines au concile de Nicée. Tome II, de Saint Clément à Saint Irénée (Paris, 1928; = Bibliothèque de théologie historique).
- F. Legge, Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity. Being Studies in Religious History

- from 330 B.C. to 330 A.D., 2 vols.
in one (r.p., New York, 1950).
- J. Liébaert, L'Incarnation I: Dès origines au concile de Chalcedoine (Paris, 1966; = Histoire des dogmes Tome III, fasc. I/a).
- J.B. Lightfoot, Notes on Epistles of St Paul from unpublished Commentaries (2nd ed., London, 1904).
- S.R.C. Lilla, Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian Platonism and Gnosticism (Oxford, 1971 ; = Oxford Theological Monographs).
- V.A.S. Little, The Christology of the Apologists (London, 1934).
- R.N. Longenecker, The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity (London, 1970; = SBT 2nd series 17).
- F. Loofs, Theophilus von Antiochien adversus Marcionem und die anderen theologischen Quellen bei Irenaeus (Leipzig, 1930; = TU 46/2).
- S. Lundström, Studien zur lateinischen Irenäus-übersetzung (Lund, 1943).
- A. Luneau, L'Histoire du Salut chez les Pères de l'Église. La doctrine des Ages du Monde (Paris, 1964; = Théologie Historique 2).
- R.L.P. Milburn, Early Christian Interpretations of History (London, 1954; = The Bampton Lectures of 1952).
- L.L. Mitchell, Baptismal Anointing (London, 1966; = Alcuin Club Collections 48).
- J.T. Nielsen, Adam and Christ in the Theology of Irenaeus of Lyons. An examination of the function of the Adam-Christ typology in the Adversus Haereses of Irenaeus, against the background of

- the Gnosticism of his time (Assen, 1968; = van Goreum's theologische Bibliotheek 40).
- J. Ochagavía, Visibile Patris Filius. A Study of Irenaeus' Teaching on Revelation and Tradition (Rome, 1964; = Orientalia Christiana Analecta 171).
- L.G. Patterson, God and History in Early Christian Thought. A Study of Themes from Justin Martyr to Gregory the Great (London, 1967; = Studies in Patristic Thought).
- T.E. Pollard, Johannine Christology and the Early Church (Cambridge, 1970; = Society for NTS Monograph Series 13).
- G.L. Prestige, Fathers and Heretics. Six Studies in Dogmatic Faith with Prologue and Epilogue (London, 1940; = The Bampton Lectures for 1940).
- _____, God in Patristic Thought (2nd ed., London, 1952).
- L. Prigent, Les Testimonia dans le christianisme primitif: L'Épître de Barnabé I - XVI et ses sources (Paris, 1961; = Études Bibliques).
- G. Quispel, Gnosis als Weltreligion (Zürich, 1951).
- M. Rackl, Die Christologie des heiligen Ignatius von Antiochien nebst einer Voruntersuchung der Echtheit der sieben ignatianischen Briefe verteidigt gegen Daniel Völter (Freiburg i.B., 1914; = Freiburger theologischen Studien 14).
- B. Reicke, The Disobedient Spirits and Christian Baptism. A Study of I Pet. 3.19 and its Context (Copenhagen, 1946).
- B. Reynders, Lexique comparé du texte grec et des versions latine, arménienne et syriaque de L'"Adversus Haereses" de saint Irénée, 2 vols. (Louvain, 1954; =

- _____ , Vocabulaire de la "Démonstration" et des fragments de saint Irénée (Chevetogne, 1958).
- A. Richardson, History Sacred and Profane (London, 1964; = The Bampton Lectures for 1962).
- C.C. Richardson, The Christianity of Ignatius of Antioch (New York, 1935).
- P. Richardson, Israel in the Apostolic Church (Cambridge, 1969; = Society for NTS Monograph Series 10).
- J.A. Robinson, St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians (2nd ed., London, 1909).
- J.M. Robinson and H. Koester, Trajectories through Early Christianity (Philadelphia, 1971).
- F.M.M. Sagnard, La Gnose valentinienne et le témoignage de saint Irénée (Paris, 1947; = Études de philosophie médiévale 36).
- W. Sanday and C.H. Turner (edd.), Novum Testamentum sancti Irenaei episcopi Lugdunensis. Being the New Testament Quotations in the Old-Latin Version of the "Ελεγχος καὶ παρατροπή ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως" (Oxford, 1923; = Old-Latin Biblical Texts 7).
- E. Scharl, Recapitulatio Mundi. Der Rekapitulationsbegriff des heiligen Irenäus und seine Anwendung auf die Körperwelt (Freiburg i.B., 1941; = Freiburger theologische Studien 60).
- H.M. Schenke, Die Herkunft des sogenannten Evangelium Veritatis (Göttingen, 1959).
- H. Schlier, Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den Ignatiusbriefen (Giessen, 1929; = Beiheft zur ZNTW 8).
- W. Schmidt, Die Kirche bei Irenäus (Helsinki, 1934).
- H.J. Schoeps, Theologie und Geschichte des Judentums (Tübingen, 1949).

- D.M. Scholer, Nag Hammadi Bibliography 1948 - 1969
(Leiden, 1971; = Nag Hammadi Studies
I)
- L. Schottroff, Der Glaubende und die feindliche Welt.
Beobachtungen zum gnostischen Dualismus
und seiner Bedeutung für Paulus und das
Johannesevangelium (Neukirchen-Vluyn,
1970; = Wissenschaftliche Monographien
zum Alten und Neuen Testament 37).
- E.F. Scott, The Epistles of Paul to the Colossians,
to Philemon and to the Ephesians (London,
1930; = The Moffatt NT Commentary).
- R. Seeberg, Text-Book of the History of Doctrines,
ET, 2 vols. (Grand Rapids, 1952).
- K.G. Semisch, Justin Martyr; his Life, Writings and
Opinions, ET, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1843;
= The Biblical Cabinet 41, 42).
- E. Sjöberg, Der verborgene Menschensohn in den
Evangelien (Lund, 1955; = Skrifter
Utgivna av kungl. humanistika Vetenskaps-
samfundet 1).
- M. Spanneut, Le stoïcisme des pères de l'Église de
Clément de Rome à Clément d'Alexandrie
(2nd ed., Paris, 1969; = Patristica
Sorbonensia 1).
- W. Staerk, Die Erlösererwartung in den östlichen
Religionen. Untersuchungen zu den
Ausdrucksformen der biblischen Christ-
ologie (Soter II) (Stuttgart & Berlin,
1938).
- C.I.K. Story, The Nature of Truth in "the Gospel of
Truth" and in the Writings of Justin
Martyr. A Study of the Pattern of
Orthodoxy in the Middle of the Second
Christian Century (Leiden, 1970; =
Supplements to NT 25).
- G. Strecker, Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudo-
klementinen (Berlin, 1958; = TU 70).

- H.E.W. Turner, The Patristic Doctrine of Redemption. A Study of the Development of Doctrine during the First Five Centuries (London, 1952).
- _____, The Pattern of Christian Truth. A Study in the Relations between Orthodoxy and Heresy in the Early Church (London, 1954; = The Bampton Lectures for 1954).
- H.E.W. Turner and H. Montefiore, Thomas and the Evangelists (London, 1962; = SBT 35).
- W.C. van Unnik, Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings. A preliminary survey of the Nag Hammadi find (London, 1960; = SBT 30).
- M. Werner, The Formation of Christian Dogma. An Historical Study of its Problems, ET ed. S.G.F. Brandon (London, 1957).
- B.F. Westcott, Saint Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians (London, 1906).
- N.P. Williams, The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin. A Historical and Critical Study (London, 1929; = The Bampton Lectures for 1924).
- R.McL. Wilson, The Gnostic Problem. A Study of the Relations between Hellenistic Judaism and the Gnostic Heresy (London, 1958).
- _____, Gnosis and the New Testament (Oxford, 1968).
- _____, Studies in the Gospel of Thomas (London, 1960).
- G. Wingren, Man and the Incarnation. A Study in the Biblical Theology of Irenaeus, ET (London, 1959).
- H.A. Wolfson, The Philosophy of the Church Fathers, vol. 1, Faith, Trinity, Incarnation (Cambridge (Mass.), 1956; = Structure and Growth of Philosophic Systems from Plato to Spinoza 3).
- E.M. Yamauchi, Pre-Christian Gnosticism: A Survey of the proposed Evidences (London, 1973).

- J. Zandee, The Terminology of Plotinus and of Some Gnostic Writings, mainly the Fourth Treatise of the Jung Codex (Leiden, 1961).
- H. Ziegler, Irenäus der Bischof von Lyon. Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte der altkatholischen Kirche (Berlin, 1871).

IV ARTICLES

- A. d'Alès, 'La doctrine de la récapitulation en saint Irénée', in RSR 6(1916), pp. 185 - 211.
- _____, 'La doctrine de l'Esprit en saint Irénée', in RSR 14(1924), pp. 497 - 538.
- _____, 'La doctrine eucharistique de saint Irénée', RSR 13(1923), pp. 24 - 46.
- H.D. Altendorf, 'Zum Stichwort: Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im Ältesten Christentum', in ZKG 80(1969), pp. 61 - 74.
- E. Amann, Review of F. Loofs, Theophilus von Antiochien, in RevSR 12(1938), pp. 238 - 55.
- _____, 'Sibyllins (Livres)', in DTC vol. 14, pt. 2, cols. 2027 - 32.
- C. Andresen, 'Justin und der mittlere Platonismus', in ZNTW 44(1952-53), pp. 157 - 95.
- S. Arai, 'Zur Christologie des Apokryphons des Johannes', in NTS 15(1969), pp. 302 - 18.
- G. Bardy, Review of C. Schmidt, Gespräche Jesu mit seinen Jüngern nach der Auferstehung, in RB 30(1921), pp. 110 - 34.
- C.K. Barrett, 'The Gospel of Truth. The Editio Princeps of an Ancient Gnostic Text', in ExpT 69 (1957-58), pp. 167 - 70.

- L. Baur, 'Untersuchungen über die Vergöttlichungslehre', in TQ 101(1920), pp. 28 - 64, 155 - 86.
- H.D. Betz, 'Orthodoxy and Heresy in Primitive Christianity', in Interpretation 19 (1965), pp. 299 - 311.
- U. Bianchi, 'Proposal for a terminological and conceptual agreement with regard to the theme of the Colloquium', in Origini, pp. xxvi - xxix.
- J.N. Birdsall, 'Melito of Sardis περί τοῦ Πάσχα in a Georgian version', in Le Muséon 80 (1967), pp. 121 - 38.
- H.A. Blair, 'Valentinus and the Arian Christ', in CQR 148(1949), pp. 1 - 16.
- A. Böhlig, 'Zur Ursprache des Evangelium Veritatis', in Le Muséon 79(1966), pp. 317 - 333.
- _____, 'Urzeit und Endzeit in einem titellosen gnostischen Werk aus Nag Hamadi', in Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg 10(1961), pp. 1065 - 69.
- G.N. Bonwetsch, 'Der Gedanke der Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts bei Irenäus', in ZSTh 1(1923), pp. 637 - 49.
- J.W. Bowman, 'The Bible and Modern Religions II: Dispensationalism', in Interpretation 10(1956), pp. 170 - 87.
- M. O'R. Boyle, 'Irenaeus Millennial Hope: A Polemical Weapon', in RTAM 36(1969), pp. 5 - 16.
- R. Cantalamessa, 'Méliton de Sardes. Une christologie anti-gnostique du IIe siècle', RevSR 37(1963), pp. 1 - 26.
- R.P. Casey, 'Two Notes on Valentinian Theology', in HThR 23(1930), pp. 275 - 98.

- O. Clausen, 'Die Theologie des Theophilus von Antiochien', in Zeitschrift für wissenschaftlicher Theologie 46(1903), pp. 81 - 141, 195 - 213.
- M. Cramer, 'Zur Deutung des Ausdrucks "Gnosis" im "Evangelium Veritatis"', in Studia Biblica et Orientalia III: Oriens Antiquus (= Analecta Biblica 12(1959)), pp. 48 - 56.
- J. Daniélou, 'Figure et événement chez Méliton de Sardes', in Neotestamentica et Patristica, ed. W.C. van Unnik (Leiden, 1962; = Supplement to NT 6), pp. 282 - 92.
- _____, 'Judéo-Christianisme et Gnose', in Aspects du Judéo-Christianisme. Colloque de Strasbourg 23 - 25 avril 1964 (Paris, 1965), pp. 139 - 64.
- _____, 'Saint Irénée et les origines de la théologie de l'histoire', in RSR 34 (1947), pp. 227 - 31.
- A. Ll. Davies, 'Ascension of Isaiah', in Dictionary of the Apostolic Church, ed. J. Hastings, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1915), vol. 1, pp. 99 - 102.
- O. Dibelius, 'Studien zur Geschichte der Valentinianer', in ZNTW 9(1908), pp. 230 - 47, 329 - 40.
- H. Duensing, Review of C. Schmidt, Gespräche Jesu mit seinen Jüngern nach der Auferstehung in Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen 184(1922), pp. 241 - 52.
- W. Dunn, 'What does "Gospel of Truth" mean?', in VC 15(1961), pp. 160 - 64.
- A.A.T. Ehrhardt, 'Christianity before the Apostles' Creed', in HThR 55(1962), pp. 73 - 119; = *ibid.* in The Framework of the New Testament Stories (Manchester, 1964), pp. 151 - 99.

- L. Escoula, 'Saint Irénée et la connaissance naturelle de Dieu', in RevSR 14(1940), pp. 252 - 70.
- _____, 'Le Verbe Sauveur et Illuminateur chez saint Irénée', in NRTh 66(1939), pp. 385 - 400, 551 - 67.
- P. Éviéux, 'Théologie de l'accoutumance chez saint Irénée', in RSR 55(1967), pp. 5 - 54.
- G. Fecht, 'Der erste "Teil" des sogenannten Evangelium Veritatis (S. 16.31 - 22.20) I: Kapitel⁴ 1, Str. I - III', in Orientalia 30(1961), pp. 371 - 90; *ibid.* 'II: Kapitel⁴ 1, Str. IV - Kapitel⁴ 2, Str. VII', in Orientalia 31(1962), pp. 85 - 119; *ibid.* 'III: Kapitel⁴ 2, Str. VIII - Kapitel⁴ 3, Str. IX', in Orientalia 32(1963), pp. 298 - 335.
- A.J. Festugière, 'Notes sur les Extraits de Théodote de Clément d'Alexandrie et sur les fragments de Valentin', in VC 3 (1949), pp. 193 - 207.
- W. Foerster, 'Das Apokryphon des Johannes', in Gott und die Götter: Festgabe für Erich Fascher zum 60 Geburtstag (Berlin, 1958), pp. 134 - 41.
- _____, 'Die Grundzüge der ptolemaeischen Gnosis', in NTS 6(1959-60), pp. 16 - 31.
- P. Gächter, 'Unsere Einheit mit Christus nach dem hl. Irenäus', in ZkathTh 58(1934), pp. 503 - 34.
- S. Giet, 'Un courant judéo-chrétien à Rome au milieu du IIe siècle?', in Aspects du Judéo-Christianisme. Colloque de Strasbourg 23 - 25 avril 1964 (Paris, 1965), pp. 95 - 111.
- R.M. Grant, 'The Bible of Theophilus of Antioch',

- _____,'
 _____,'
 R. Haardt, 'Gnosis', in Sacramentum Mundi. An Encyclopedia of Theology (London, 1968 - 70), vol. 2, pp. 376 - 79.
 _____,' 'Gnosticism', in Sacramentum Mundi. An Encyclopedia of Theology (London, 1968 - 70), vol. 2, pp. 379 - 81.
 _____,' 'Zur Struktur des Plane-Mythos im Evangelium Veritatis des Codex Jung', in Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 58(1962), pp. 24 - 38.
 _____,' 'Das universaleschatologische Vorstellungsgut in der Gnosis', in Vom Messias zum Christus, ed. K. Schubert (Vienna, Freiburg, Basel, 1964), pp. 315 - 36.
 _____,' 'Zwanzig Jahre Erforschung der koptisch-gnostischen Schriften von Nag Hammadi', in ThPh 42(1967), pp. 390 - 401.
 E. Haenchen, 'Literatur zum Codex Jung', in ThR N.F. 30(1964), pp. 39 - 82.
 S.G. Hall, 'Melito in the Light of the Passover Haggadah', in JTS n.s. 22(1971), pp. 29 - 46.
 A. von Harnack, 'Der Presbyter-Prediger des Irenäus (IV 27.1 - 32.1). Bruchstücke und Nachklänge der ältesten exegetisch-polemischen Homilien', in Philotesia. Paul Kleinert zum LXX Geburtstag dargebracht (Berlin, 1907), pp. 1 - 37.
 _____,' 'Untersuchungen über den apokryphen Briefwechsel der Korinther mit dem Apostel Paulus', in Sitzungsbericht

- der kon. preuss. Akad. 1905 I, pp. 3 - 35.
- F.R.M. Hitchcock, 'Loofs' Asiatic Source (IQA) and the Ps.-Justin De Resurrectione', in ZNTW 36(1937), pp. 35 - 60.
- _____, 'Loofs' Theory of Theophilus of Antioch as a Source of Irenaeus', in JTS 38(1937), pp. 130 - 39, 255 - 66.
- H. Holstein, 'Les formules du Symbole dans l'oeuvre de saint Irénée', in RSR 34(1947), pp. 454 - 61.
- _____, 'Propter potentiorum principalitatem. (Saint Irénée, Adversus Haereses, III 3.2)', in RSR 36(1949), pp. 122 - 35.
- _____, 'La tradition des Apôtres chez saint Irénée', in RSR 36(1949), pp. 229 - 70.
- R. Holte, 'Logos Spermatikos.. Christianity and Ancient Philosophy according to St. Justin's Apologies', in StTh 12(1958), pp. 108 - 68.
- W. Hunger, 'Der Gedanke der Weltplaneinheit und Adameinheit in der Theologie des heiligen Irenäus.. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis seiner Arbeitsweise', in Scholastik 17(1942), pp. 161 - 77.
- H.L. Jansen, 'Der Begriff ΠΝΗΡΥ, "Das All", im Evangelium Veritatis', in Acta Orientalia 31(1968), pp. 115 - 18.
- _____, 'Spuren sakramentaler Handlungen im Evangelium Veritatis?', in Acta Orientalia 28(1964-65), pp. 215 - 19.
- H. Jonas, 'Evangelium Veritatis and the Valentinian Speculation', in Studia Patristica, vol. 6, ed. F.L. Cross (Berlin, 1962; = TU 81), pp. 96 - 111.

- _____,
Review of Evangelium Veritatis, ed.
M. Malinine et al., in Gnomon 32(1960),
pp. 327 - 35.
- _____,
'Response to G. Quispel's "Gnosticism
and the New Testament"', in The Bible
in Modern Scholarship, ed. J.P. Hyatt
(London, 1966), pp. 279 - 93.
- G. Jouassard,
'"Le premier-né de la Vierge" chez
saint Irénée et saint Hippolyte', in
RevSR 12(1932), pp. 509 - 32; 13(1933),
pp. 25 - 37.
- R. Kasser,
'Le "Livre secret de Jean" dans ses
différentes formes textuelles coptes',
in Le Muséon 77(1964), pp. 5 - 16.
- _____,
'Les subdivisions du Tractatus Tripar-
titus', in Le Muséon 82(1969), pp. 101
- 21.
- A.F.J. Klijn,
'The Apocryphal Correspondence between
Paul and the Corinthians', in VC 17
(1963), pp. 2 - 23.
- H. Koch,
'Die Sündenvergebung bei Irenäus',
in ZNTW 9(1908), pp. 35 - 46.
- H. Koester,
'Gnomai Diaphoroi. The Origin and
Nature of Diversification in the
History of Early Christianity', in HThR
58(1965), pp. 279 - 318; = *ibid.* in
Trajectories through Early Christ-
ianity, ed. J.M. Robinson and H.
Koester (Philadelphia, 1971), pp. 114
- 57.
- A. Kurfess,
'Oracula Sibyllina I/II', in ZNTW
40(1941), pp. 151 - 65.
- E. Lanne,
'Chérubim et Séraphim. Essai d'int-
erprétation du ch. 10 de la Démon-
stration de S. Irénée', in RSR 43
(1955), pp. 524 - 35.
- J. Lebreton,
'La connaissance de Dieu chez saint
Irénée', in RSR 16(1926), pp. 385 -
406.

- J. Leipoldt, 'Das "Evangelium der Wahrheit"', in TLZ 82(1957), cols. 825 - 34.
- G.W. MacRae, 'The Jewish Background of the Gnostic Sophia Myth', in NT 12(1970), pp. 86 - 101.
- _____, 'Sleep and Awakening in Gnostic Texts', in Origini, pp. 496 - 507.
- R.A. Markus, 'Pleroma and Fulfilment', in VC 8(1954), pp. 193 - 224.
- _____, 'Trinitarian Theology and the Economy', in JTS n.s. 9(1958), pp. 89 - 102.
- H.I. Marrou, 'L'Évangile de Vérité et la diffusion du comput digital dans l'antiquité', in VC 12(1958), pp. 98 - 103.
- _____, 'La théologie de l'histoire dans la gnose valentinienne', in Origini, pp. 215 - 25.
- J.E. Ménard, 'La "connaissance" dans l'Évangile de Vérité', in RevSR 41(1967), pp. 1 - 28.
- _____, 'Les élucubrations de l'Evangelium Veritatis sur le "Nom"', in SMR 5 (1962), pp. 185 - 214.
- _____, 'L"Évangile de Vérité" et le Dieu caché et invisible des littératures antiques', in SMR 8(1965), pp. 193 - 212; = *ibid.* in RevSR 45(1971), pp. 146 - 61.
- _____, 'L'Évangile selon Philippe et la gnose', in RevSR 41(1967), pp. 305 - 17.
- _____, 'Les Origines de la Gnose I - Le Colloque de Messine', in RevSR 42 (1968), pp. 24 - 38.
- _____, 'La πλάνη dans l'Évangile de Vérité', in SMR 7(1964), pp. 3 - 36.
- _____, 'Le sens de γνῶσις dans l'Évangile de Vérité', in SMR 6(1963), pp. 57 - 73.

- _____,
'La structure et la langue originale de l'Évangile de Vérité', in RevSR 44(1970), pp. 128 - 37.
- A. Merk,
'Der Text des Neuen Testaments beim heiligen Irenaeus', ZkathTh 49(1925), pp. 302 - 15.
- O. Michel,
'οἰκονομία', in TWNT, ET, vol. 5, pp. 151 - 53.
- J. Michl,
'Sibyllinen, Sibyllinische Orakel oder Bücher', in Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche (Freiburg, 1964), vol. 9, cols. 728f.
- J. Moffatt,
'Sibylline Oracles', in Dictionary of the Apostolic Church, ed. J. Hastings 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1918), vol. 2, pp. 477 - 90.
- K. Müller,
'Beiträge zum Verständnis der valentinianischen Gnosis', in Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse 1920 (Berlin, 1920), pp. 179 - 242.
- J. Munck,
'Evangelium Veritatis and Greek Usage as to Book Titles', in StTh 17(1963), pp. 133 - 38.
- P. Nagel,
'Die Herkunft des Evangelium Veritatis in sprachlicher Sicht', in OLZ 61(1966), pp. 5 - 14.
- M.L. Peel,
'Gnostic Eschatology and the New Testament', in NT 12(1970), pp. 141 - 65.
- O. Perler,
'Recherches sur le Peri Pascha de Méliton', in RSR 51(1963), pp. 407 - 21.
- S. Pétrement,
'Le colloque de Messine et le problème du gnosticisme', in RMM 72(1967), pp. 344 - 73.
- _____,
'La notion de gnosticisme', in RMM 65(1960), pp. 385 - 421.

- _____, 'Valentin est-il l'auteur de l'épître à Diognète?', in Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses 46(1966), pp. 34 - 62.
- O. Plöger, 'Esrabücher IV: Das 5. und 6. Esrabuch', in Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart (3rd ed., Tübingen, 1957 - 62), vol. 2, cols. 699f.
- P. Pokorný, 'Gnosis als Weltreligion und als Häresie', Numen 16(1969), pp. 51 - 62.
- R. Potter, 'St. Irenaeus and "Recapitulation"', in Dominican Studies 4(1951), pp. 192 - 200.
- K. Prüm, 'Göttliche Planung und menschliche Entwicklung nach Irenäus Adversus haereses', in Scholastik 13(1938), pp. 206 - 24, 342 - 66.
- _____, 'Zur Terminologie und zum Wesen der christlichen Neuheit bei Irenäus', in Pisciculi. Studien zur Religion und Kultur des Altertums, ed. T. Klauser and A. Röhner (Münster i.W., 1939; = Antike und Christentum Ergänzungsband 1), pp. 192 - 219.
- H.C. Puech, 'Gnosis and Time', in Man and Time: Papers from the Eranos Yearbooks, ET (New York, 1957; = Bollingen Series XXX/3), pp. 38 - 84.
- _____, 'The Jung Codex and the other Gnostic Documents from Nag Hammadi', in The Jung Codex. A Newly Recovered Gnostic Papyrus, ed. F.L. Cross (London, 1955), pp. 11 - 34.
- _____, 'Les nouveaux écrits gnostiques découverts en Haute-Égypte', in Coptic Studies in Honour of Walter Ewing Crum (Boston, 1950), pp. 91 - 154.

- H.C. Puech and G. Quispel, 'Les écrits gnostiques du Codex Jung', in VC 8(1954), pp. 1 - 51.
- _____, 'Le quatrième écrit gnostique du Codex Jung', in VC 9(1955), pp. 65 - 102.
- G. Quispel, 'La conception de l'homme dans la gnose valentinienne', Eranos-Jahrbuch 15(1947), pp. 249 - 86.
- _____, 'The Jung Codex and its Significance', in The Jung Codex. A Newly Recovered Gnostic Papyrus, ed. F.L. Cross (London, 1955), pp. 37 - 78.
- _____, 'La lettre de Ptolémée à Flora', in VC 2(1948), pp. 17 - 56; = id., Ptolémée: Lettre à Flora, pp. 7 - 40.
- _____, 'Neue Funde zur valentinianischen Gnosis. Der Codex Jung', in ZRGG 6(1954), pp. 289 - 305.
- _____, 'The Original Doctrine of Valentine', in VC 1(1947), pp. 43 - 73.
- G. Racle, 'A propos du Christ-Père dans l'Homélie pascalle de Mélicon de Sardes', in RSR 50(1962), pp. 400 - 08.
- B. Rehm, 'Zur Entstehung der pseudoclementinischen Schriften', in ZNTW 37(1938), pp. 77 - 184.
- J. Reumann, 'OIKONOMIA - Terms in Paul in Comparison with Lucan Heilsgeschichte', in NTS 13 (1967), pp. 147 - 67.
- B. Reynders, 'Optimisme et théocentrisme chez saint Irénée', in RTAM 8(1936), pp. 225 - 52.
- _____, 'Paradosis. Le progrès de l'idée de tradition jusqu'à saint Irénée', in RTAM 5(1933), pp. 155 - 91.
- _____, 'La polémique de saint Irénée. Méthode et principes', in RTAM 7(1935), pp. 5 - 27.
- H. Ringgren, 'The Gospel of Truth and Valentinian Gnosticism', in StTh 18(1964), pp. 51 -65.

- M. Rist, 'Isaiah, Ascension of', in The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible (New York, 1962), vol. 2, pp. 744 - 46.
- A.C. Robison, 'The Evangelium Veritatis: Its Doctrine, Character and Origin', in JR 43(1963), pp. 234 - 43.
- A. Rousseau, 'La doctrine de saint Irénée sur la préexistence du Fils de Dieu dans Dém. 43', in Le Muséon 84(1971), pp. 5 - 42.
- K. Rudolph, 'Gnosis und Gnostizismus, ein Forschungsbericht', in ThR N.F. 34(1969), pp. 121 - 75, 181 - 231; 36(1971), pp. 1 - 61, 89 - 124.
- A. Rzach, 'Sibyllinische Orakel. C: Sibyllinische Orakel jüdischer und christlicher Herkunft', in Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, Section II, vol. 2, cols. 2117 - 69.
- H.M. Schenke, 'Das Ägypter-Evangelium aus Nag-Hammadi-Codex III', in NTS 16(1970), pp. 196 - 208.
- _____, 'Nag-Hamadi Studien I: Das literarische Problem des Apokryphon Johannis', in ZRGG 14(1962), pp. 57 - 63.
- _____, 'Nag Hamadi Studien III: Die Spitze des dem Apokryphon Johannis und der Sophia Jesu Christi zugrundeliegenden gnostischen Systems', in ZRGG 14(1962), pp. 352 - 61.
- C. Schmidt, 'Irenäus und seine Quelle in Adv. Haer. I 29', in Philotesia. Paul Kleinert zum LXX Geburtstag dargebracht (Berlin, 1907), pp. 317 - 36.
- H.J. Schoeps, 'Judenchristentum und Gnosis', in Origini, pp. 528 - 36.
- _____, 'Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudoklementinen', in ZRGG 11(1959), pp. 72 - 77.

- _____, 'Die Pseudoklementinen und das Urchristentum', in ZRGG 10(1958), pp. 3 - 15.
- L. Schotttroff, 'Heil als innerweltliche Entweltlichung. Der gnostische Hintergrund der johanneischen Vorstellung vom Zeitpunkt der Erlösung', in NT 11(1969), pp. 294 - 317.
- B. Seeberg, 'Die Geschichtstheologie Justins des Märtyrers', in ZKG 58(1939), pp. 1 - 81.
- E. Segelberg, 'The Coptic-Gnostic Gospel according to Philip and its Sacramental System', in Numen 7(1960), pp. 189 - 200.
- _____, 'Evangelium Veritatis - A Confirmation Homily and its Relation to the Odes of Solomon', in Orientalia Suecana 8(1959), pp. 1 - 42.
- J.P. Smith, 'Hebrew Christian Midrash in Irenaeus, Epid. 43', in Biblica 38(1957), pp. 24 - 34.
- W. Staerk, 'Der eschatologische Mythos in der altchristlichen Theologie', in ZNTW 35 (1936), pp. 83 - 95.
- _____, 'Eva-Maria. Ein Beitrag zur Denk- und Sprechweise der altkirchlichen Christologie', in ZNTW 33(1934), pp. 97 - 104.
- G.C. Stead, 'The Valentinian Myth of Sophia', in JTS n.s. 20(1969), pp. 75 - 104.
- W.C. Till, 'Bemerkungen zur Erstausgabe des "Evangelium Veritatis"', in Orientalia 27(1958), pp. 269 - 86.
- W. Tooley, 'Stewards of God. An Examination of the terms OIKONOMOI and OIKONOMIA in the New Testament', in ScJTh 19(1966), pp. 74 - 86.
- D. Unger, 'Christ's Role in the Universe according to St. Irenaeus', in Franciscan Studies 26(1945), pp. 3 - 20.

- W.C. van Unnik, 'The "Gospel of Truth" and the New Testament', in The Jung Codex. A Newly Recovered Gnostic Papyrus, ed. F.L. Cross (London, 1955), pp. 79 - 129.
- _____, 'The Newly Discovered Gnostic "Epistle to Rheginos" on the Resurrection', in JEH 15(1964), pp. 141 - 67.
- _____, 'The Origin of the recently discovered "Apocryphon Jacobi"', in VQ 10(1956), pp. 149 - 56.
- _____, 'Three Notes on the "Gospel of Philip"', in NTS 10(1963-64), pp. 465 - 69.
- F. Vernet, 'Irénee (saint)', in DTC, vol. 7, cols. 2394 - 2533.
- A. Verriélé, 'Le plan du salut d'après saint Irénée', in RevSR 14(1934), pp. 493 - 524.
- M. Villain, 'Une vive conscience de l'unité du corps mystique. St Ignace d'Antioche et St Irénée, in Revue pratique d'apologétique 66(1938), pp. 257 - 71.
- M. Widmann, 'Irenäus und seine theologischen Väter', in ZThK 54(1957), pp. 156 - 73.
- A. Wifstrand, 'The Homily of Melito on the Passion', in VC 2(1948), pp. 201 - 23.
- R.McL. Wilson, 'The Early History of the Exegesis of Gen. 1.26', in Studia Patristica I, ed. K. Aland and F.L. Cross (Berlin, 1957; = TU 63), pp. 420 - 37.
- _____, 'The Gospel of Philip', in Studies in Church History, vol. 1, ed. C.W. Dugmore and C. Duggan (London, 1964), pp. 98 - 103.
- _____, 'The New Testament in the Nag Hammadi Gospel of Philip', in NTS 9(1962-63), pp. 291 - 94.
- _____, 'A Note on the Gospel of Truth (33.8 - 9)', in NTS 9(1962-63), pp. 295 - 98.

_____,

'Response to G. Quispel's "Gnosticism and the New Testament"', in The Bible in Modern Scholarship, ed. J.P. Hyatt (London, 1966), pp. 272 - 78.

J. Zandee,

'Gnostic Ideas on the Fall and Salvation', in Numen 11(1964), pp. 13 - 74.

_____,

'De Opstanding in de Brief aan Rheginos en in het Evengelie van Philippus', in NTT 16(1961-62), pp. 361 - 77.

_____,

'Gnostische Trekken in een Apocryphe Brief van Jacobus', in NTT 17(1962-63), pp. 401 - 22.

_____,

'Die Person der Sophia in der vierten Schrift des Codex Jung', in Origini, pp. 203 - 12.